OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO. ED 031605			
CH ACC. NO. AA 000 390	**P.A.** 24	**PUBL. DATE** Aug 69	**ISSUE** RIEJAN70

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Simpson, Richard L.

TITLE
The School Teacher: Social Values, Community Role, and Professional Self-Image. Final Report.

SOURCE CODE QXM63975	**INSTITUTION (SOURCE)** North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. Inst. for Research in Social Science.
SP. AG. CODE RMQ66004	**SPONSORING AGENCY** Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

EDRS PRICE 1.25;15.10	**CONTRACT NO.** OEC-SAE-8703	**GRANT NO.**

REPORT NO.	**BUREAU NO.** BR-5-0451

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
300p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Public School Teachers; *Professional Recognition; *Teaching; *Professional Occupations; *Goal Orientation; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Administrator Attitudes; Teacher Role; Administrator Role; Education Majors; Self Concept; Career Planning

IDENTIFIERS
North Carolina

ABSTRACT

This research study began as an attempt to discover the extent of professionalism and variables (individual, community, school, etc.) related to it among public school teachers. Preliminary analysis of survey data gathered from 3189 undergraduate college students and 9688 public school teachers indicated few relationships of any of the independent study variables to professionalism, and weak interrelations among the different aspects of professionalism. (Most of the related negative results are not presented in the report. The data-gathering instruments and a list of variables derived from them are included.) The principal focus of the research was therefore shifted somewhat, with primary attention devoted to an examination of such questions as: (1) the extent to which, and the ways in which, teaching is a professional occupation; (2) why teachers are not more professional; (3) why schools are not administered in more professionalizing ways; and (4) what the prospects are of altering the situation. The main general conclusion was that teaching is not a profession, mainly because it is a predominantly feminine occupation. The primacy of family rather than work role orientations among women keeps them from being professional in outlook or behavior. School administrators behave accordingly, so that schools are run bureaucratically rather than through collegial control by professional colleague groups. The resulting atmosphere in the schools affects male teachers, through selective recruitment into teaching of men whose orientations fit the prevailing situation and through pressures to conform. The situation is not likely to change. (Author/JH)

BR 5-0451
PA 24
OE/BR

ED 021 605

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 5-0451

O. E. Contract No. SAE-8703

THE SCHOOL TEACHER: SOCIAL VALUES, COMMUNITY ROLE, AND PROFESSIONAL SELF-IMAGE

Richard L. Simpson
Institute for Research in Social Science
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

AA 000 390

Final Report
Project No. 5-0451
O. E. Contract No. SAE-8703

THE SCHOOL TEACHER: SOCIAL VALUES, COMMUNITY ROLE, AND PROFESSIONAL SELF-IMAGE

Richard L. Simpson

Institute for Research in Social Science
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

August 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

List of Tables. ii
Acknowledgments viii
Summary xii

I The Research Problem: Professionalism among School Teachers. I-1
II Research Methods. II-1
III Are Teachers Professionals? III-1
IV Who Are the Professionals?. IV-1
V If Teachers Are Not Professionals, What Are They? . . V-1
VI Why Are Teachers Not More Professional? VI-1
VII What Might Be Done to Professionalize Teachers? . . . VII-1

Appendixes

A The Teacher Questionnaire
B The College Student Questionnaire
C List of Variables
D The Method of Classifying School Characteristics for Contextual and School-As-Unit Analysis
E The Code Used to Classify Fathers' and Spouses' Occupations
F Bibliography

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

III-1. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Nineteen Variables III-3

III-2. Professionally Relevant Attitudes and Behaviors of Student Education Majors Planning Careers in Education, of Education Majors Not Planning Careers in Education, and of Students Not Majoring in Education . . III-7

III-3. Career Enthusiasm and Plans, Amount of Daily Study, and Occupational Reference Groups of Student Education Majors Planning Careers in Education, of Education Majors Not Planning Careers in Education, and of Students Not Majoring in Education, by Number of Professors in Major Subject Known Well and by Number of Courses Taken in Major Subject III-10

III-4. Percentages of Teachers Who Said that Teaching Was the Most Satisfying Career They Could Realistically Imagine, by Selected Professionally Relevant Variables III-13

III-5. Percentages of Teachers Who Said that Their Current Positions Were Better Than Most Teaching Positions, by Selected School Attributes III-14

III-6. Percentages of Student Education Career-Planners, Education Non-Career Planners, and Non-Education Majors Who Said that No Other Occupation Would Suit Them as Well as the One They Planned to Enter, by Selected Variables III-16

III-7. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Nine Variables, by Frequency with which Other Teachers Consulted Them III-18

III-8. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Nine Variables, by Occupational Community III-20

III-9. Percentages of Schools in Most Professional Two Quartiles of Selected Aspects of Professionalism, by School Quartile in Consultation of Teachers by Each Other (Variable 61S) III-23

III-10. Percentages of Schools in Most Professional Two Quartiles of Selected Aspects of Professionalism, by School Quartile in Occupational Community (Variable 106S) III-24

Table Page

III-11. Percentages of Student Education Career-Planners, Education Non-Career Planners, and Non-Education Majors Professionally Oriented According to Three Variables, by Amount of Social Time Spent with Majors in Same Subject III-26

III-12. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Eight Variables, by Attitude Toward Professional Self-Improvement III-29

III-13. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Seven Variables, by Bureaucratic Submission Index . . III-30

III-14. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Six Variables, by Occupational Reference Group Index III-31

III-15. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Five Variables, by Holistic Service Emphasis Index III-32

III-16. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Three Variables, by Future Career Commitment III-33

III-17. Summary of Relationships Among Professional Variables III-34

III-18. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Nine Variables, by School Quartile in Professional Zeal Index (Variable 20S) III-37

III-19. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Six Variables, by School Quartile in Bureaucratic Submission Index (Variable 25S) III-38

III-20. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Six Variables, by School Quartile in Colleague Reference Group Orientation (Variable 33S) III-39

III-21. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Five Variables, by School Quartile in Holistic Service Emphasis Index (Variable 23S). III-40

III-22. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Three Variables, by School Quartile in Future Career Commitment of Women Teachers (Variable F126S) III-41

Table Page

III-23. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Five Variables, by Frequency with which Other Teachers Consulted Them, in Schools which Were in Most Professional Two Quartiles and Least Professional Two Quartiles of School Attribute Counterparts of the Dependent Individual Variable III-44

IV-1. Teachers' Knowledge Orientation Variables by Race, Sex, and Level IV-3

IV-2. Teachers' Autonomy and Colleague Group Power Variables by Race, Sex, and Level IV-5

IV-3. Teachers' Occupational Reference Group Index by Race, Sex, and Level IV-7

IV-4. Teachers' Holistic Service Orientation Variables by Race, Sex, and Level. IV-8

IV-5. Teachers'Intrinsic Work Commitment and Career Satisfaction Variables by Race, Sex, and Level IV-10

IV-6. Teachers' Job Satisfaction Variables by Race, Sex, and Level. IV-13

IV-7. Teachers' Professional Behavior Variables by Race, Sex, and Level IV-17

IV-8. Summary of Findings on Differences Between Races, Between Sexes, and Between Levels in Selected Professionally Relevant Attitudes and Behaviors. IV-19

IV-9. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Nineteen Variables, by Age IV-21

IV-10. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Nineteen Variables, by Father's Occupation IV-25

IV-11. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Nineteen Variables, by Community Origin. IV-28

IV-12. Percentages of Teachers "Highly Professional" by Race, Sex, and Level IV-34

V-1. Percentages of Teachers Who Said that Their Jobs Were Better than Most Teaching Positions, by Selected Aspects of Role-Set Relations V-2

Table Page

V-2. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Seven Variables, by Whether They Belonged to Local Voluntary Associations Because of Being Teachers (Variable 110). V-4

V-3. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Seven Variables, by Principal's Social Distance (Variable 47). V-5

V-4. Percentages of Teachers Professional According to Seven Variables, by Principal's Authoritarianism Index (Variable 42). V-7

VI-1. Future Career Commitment of Teachers by Sex, Among All Teachers and Among Young and Old Separately. . . . VI-3

VI-2. Professionalism of Men and Women Teachers According to Seven Variables, by Future Career Commitment. . . . VI-6

VI-3. Amount of Respect Attributed by Teachers to Male and Female Fifth Grade Teacher, High School Algebra Teacher, and Aspiring Elementary School Principal. . . VI-9

VI-4. Teachers' Career Satisfaction and Perceived Attitude of Parents and Community, by Sex VI-12

VI-5. Teachers' Perceptions of Sex Appropriateness of High School Subjects VI-13

VI-6. Teachers' Perceptions of Man's and Woman's Prestige among Other Teachers, If They Taught Different Subjects VI-15

VI-7. Teachers' Perceptions of Man's and Woman's Prestige with General Public, If They Taught Different Subjects VI-16

VI-8. Percentages of White Male and Female Secondary Teachers of Sexually Inappropriate Subjects Who Agreed that Their Subjects Were More Appropriate for the Other Sex, and Who Attributed High Prestige among Other Teachers and the General Public to People of Their Sexes Teaching Their Subjects. VI-20

VI-9. Career Satisfaction of White Men and Women Secondary Teachers of Sexually Inappropriate Subjects, by Whether They Denied or Accepted the Sex Stereotypes of Their Subjects. VI-21

Table Page

VI-10. Percentages of Teachers in Different Fields Who Were Male, by Race VI-23

VI-11. Percentages of Male Teachers in Different Fields Who Had Grown Up in Rural Communities, by Race VI-24

VI-12. Future Career Commitment of Women Teachers Younger than Thirty, by Race, Marital Status, and Husband's Occupation VI-29

VI-13. Percentages of Married Women Teachers Who Scored High on Reading Index and Who Spent Five or More Days a Year Attending Professional Meetings, by Race and Amount of Role Conflict VI-32

VI-14. Percentages of Teachers Who Scored High on Reading Index and Who Spent Five or More Days a Year Attending Professional Meetings, by Race and Family Situation Type. VI-34

VI-15. Percentages of Men and Women Teachers Who Said that Their Jobs Were Better than Most Teaching Positions, by Social Distance of Principal and Liking of Colleagues VI-38

VI-16. Percentages of Teachers with High Occupational Community, by Race, Sex, Marital Status, and Occupation of Spouse VI-42

VI-17. Percentages of Teachers Who Said that Their Jobs were Better than Most Teaching Positions, by Frequency of Principal's Consultation with Teachers and Principal's Social Distance from Teachers. VI-46

VI-18. Attitudes of Male Teachers Toward Aspects of Holism, Power, and Autonomy, by Sex Composition of Faculties of their Schools VI-48

VII-1. Occupations of Teachers' Fathers, by Teachers' State, Race, and Sex VII-13

VII-2. Educational Attainment of Teachers' Fathers, by Teachers' State, Race, and Sex VII-17

VII-3. Occupations of North Carolina Teachers' Fathers, by Teachers' Race, Sex, and Subject Taught. VII-19

Table | Page

VII-4. Percentages of North Carolina Teachers and Students Teaching or Preparing to Teach Different Subjects, by Race and Sex. VII-22

VII-5. Occupations of Teachers' Fathers, by Teachers' State, Race, Sex, and Age. VII-25

VII-6. Occupations of Teachers' Fathers, by Teachers' State and Detailed Age VII-28

VII-7. Comparison of Findings with Findings of Earlier Studies of Fathers' Occupations of First-Year Teachers and of Teachers Under and Over Forty Years Old. VII-30

VII-8. Father's Occupation, Father's Education, and Community Origin of Student Education and Non-Education Majors VII-32

VII-9. Father's Occupation of Student Education Career Planners, Education Non-Career Planners, and Non-Education Majors, by Race and Sex. VII-33

VII-10. Father's Education of Student Education Career Planners, Education Non-Career Planners, and Non-Education Majors, by Race and Sex. VII-34

VII-11. Community Origins of Student Education Career Planners, Education Non-Career Planners, and Non-Education Majors, by Race and Sex. VII-36

VII-12. Father's Occupation of White Student Education Career Planners, Education Non-Career Planners, and Non-Education Majors, by Sex and Type of College . . . VII-37

VII-13. Father's Education of White Student Education Career Planners, Education Non-Career Planners, and Non-Education Majors, by Sex and Type of College VII-38

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I absolve them all from blame for whatever may be wrong with this report, but I wish to thank some of the people who have helped in the research.

The research was conducted under the aegis, and with the facilities, of the Institute for Research in Social Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The Institute has provided assistance which no academic teaching department I am aware of could have provided, including a large amount of free computer time and, most important, an impressive range of expert consultation and services at all stages of the project from preparing the research proposal to getting out the final report. It is possible that I could have done this research without the help of the Institute, but it is not likely, and it is quite certain that the research would have been done less well.

I will mention only some of the Institute personnel who have helped in various ways. Daniel O. Price, former Director of the Institute, gave valuable advice on preparing the initial research proposal and getting it funded. Mrs. Myra B. Bottoms developed and supervised the complex record-keeping system to keep track of questionnaires mailed and returned. Angell G. Beza planned and supervised all stages of data processing from receipt of the questionnaires to putting the information on IBM cards, including the writing of coding instructions and the training and supervision of coders and key punchers. This was no easy task, since there were nearly 13,000 long questionnaires with numerous open-ended questions to be processed. The Institute computing staff, under the direction of Peter Harkins, gave assistance which was impressive in both its quantity and quality. In particular, Peter Harkins and Robert Littlejohn wrote new programs and program modifications tailored to the special needs of this project; Mrs. Charlette Barksdale did some ingenious detective work to uncover the source of errors on the computer tape, made by someone not connected with the Institute, which had rendered several thousand computer tables incorrect; and Ciaran Mercier did most of the programming, making no mistakes I have been able to discover and noticing inconsistencies and mistakes in my instructions to him so that I could correct them. Miss Elizabeth M. Fink, Assistant Director of the Institute, provided over-all direction of the mechanics of final report preparation, assembly, and delivery, a complex field of technology in which professors are as innocent of knowledge as lambs. Mrs. Belinda Gamble superintended the typing of the manuscript, a task in which she was aided by the intelligence and dedication of the Institute and Department of Sociology secretaries who worked with her. Mrs. Gamble deployed her forces skillfully to get the job done fast and accurately.

In the early planning of the project, I benefited from consultation with John L. Colombotos and Amitai Etzioni, both of Columbia University. My wife, Ida Harper Simpson, of Duke University, has discussed the project with me many times, and the main theme of this report--that many of the characteristics of teaching as an occupation are traceable to its being mainly a woman's occupation--took shape in the process of collaborative research with her on the characteristics of semi-professions in general.[1] Neither of us is ever sure which one has originated a particular idea in any of our collaborative research after we have finished it, but her intellectual influence pervades all of my work, including this report.

Several former graduate students who have since gone on to their professional reward played major roles in the research. Joy Gold Haralick wrote part of the teacher questionnaire, conducted the pretest described in Chapter II, and helped plan and conduct the early stages of data processing. Donald K. McBride, Charles C. Gordon, Colin K. Loftin, and Philip Kawesch took charge of data processing at one stage or another.

Ronald G. Corwin of Ohio State University generously supplied a questionnaire he had used in a study of nurses, from which a substantial number of my questions on professional, bureaucratic, and service orientations were adapted. Some other teacher questionnaire items were taken from or inspired by the work of Melvin M. Seeman.[2] Some teacher questionnaire items on husband-wife power and division of labor were taken or adapted from the work of Blood and Wolfe.[3] Some college student questionnaire items were taken from a study of adolescent orientations by Charles E. Bowerman. Still other questionnaire items have been standard ones in sociological research for so long that their origins are lost in antiquity, though they must have been invented by someone. I apologize to their creators for not being able to name them; the price of this form of immortality is anonymity.

The primary funding of this study was provided by the Office of Education, but its financial support was supplemented from other sources.

---

[1] Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, "Women and Bureaucracy in the Semi-Professions," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, New York: Free Press, 1969, pp. 196-265.

[2] Melvin M. Seeman, Social Status and Leadership: The Case of the School Executive, Columbus: Bureau of Educational Research and Service, Ohio State University, 1960.

[3] Robert O. Blood and Donald M. Wolfe, Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living, New York: Free Press, 1960.

Some early data analysis was done by National Science Foundation undergraduate research participants, especially by Joel S. Bennett, Edward W. McCranie, Reginald McLemore, and Roger S. Sennott. Much computer time was contributed free by the Computation Center and the Institute for Research in Social Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The computing services of the Institute were made possible in part by a Science Development Program grant to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill from the National Science Foundation. The University Research Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill supported the final stages of data analysis and report preparation with a grant of $400, a small but crucial sum.

The research could not have been performed without the cooperation of many school superintendents and principals who cannot be named because their school systems were promised anonymity. Officials of several educational organizations and agencies in North Carolina allowed me to mention their general approval of the project in my communications to superintendents, principals, and teachers. Their assistance is discussed in more detail in Chapter II. I am very grateful to them, for I am certain that my trading on their prestige helped to enlist the cooperation of school systems and to boost the questionnaire return rates.

My greatest debt is to the United States Office of Education and its various subunits which have been concerned with the research. From the Office of Education came most of the financial support of the study. Its personnel have been as patient as their duty to the republic allowed them to be when a series of unanticipated problems delayed my completion of the report beyond the agreed-upon deadline.

Ten M.A. theses and doctoral dissertations have come wholly or partly out of this project. Some of them were supported directly from the grant, and others made use of the data for secondary analysis. I have drawn from some of them in writing this report, and my general understanding of teachers and education has profited from all of them. They were submitted to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for degrees in sociology.

They are as follows:

1. Donald Keith McBride, "Race and Role in Teaching: A Comparative Analysis of Secondary School Teachers in North Carolina." M.A., 1963.

2. Hugh Max Miller, "Teacher Roles and Community Integration." Ph.D., 1964.

3. Robert Lloyd Hoffelder, "The Married Woman School Teacher: A Study of Role Conflict." M.A., 1964.

4. Joy Rochelle Gold, "The Effect of Administrative Atmosphere on the Role of the School Teacher." Ph.D., 1964.

5. Davida Poole Gates, "The Professional Socialization of Student Teachers in North Carolina." M.A., 1964.

6. Richard A. Lamanna, "The Negro Public School Teacher and School Desegregation: A Survey of Negro Teachers in North Carolina." Ph.D., 1966.

7. Colin Kim Loftin, "A Theoretical Framework for Predicting Participation in a Voluntary Association." M.A., 1967.

8. Bruce W. Aldrich, "Professional Employment and Family Power Relations: A Study of the Married Female School Teacher." M.A., 1967.

9. Philip M. Kawesch, "Race, Source Credibility, and Occupational Aspiration." M.A., 1968.

10. Charles Michael Wolf, "Satisfactions and Community Participation of Semi-Professional Women, by Role Preference and Life-Cycle Category" (tentative title). Ph.D., completion anticipated in 1970.

SUMMARY

The original research problem was to discover the extent of professionalism and variables related to it among public school teachers. Professionalism was defined as an orientation to specialized knowledge, a desire for autonomy, the use of colleagues as the dominant reference group, and other attitudes and behaviors associated with these orientations. Variables which it was initially thought might be related to professionalism included individual characteristics of teachers such as race, sex, subject and level taught, and age; community characteristics such as population size, quality of school facilities, and teachers' perceptions of community attitudes; attributes of the school milieu such as the principal's administrative style, teachers' relations with colleagues, and pressures toward or against professionalism from the prevailing climates of teacher opinion and behavior in different schools; and differing professional socialization experiences in college.

Paper-and-pencil questionnaire data were gathered from 3189 undergraduate students in 14 colleges and universities in North Carolina, and from 9688 public school teachers in North Carolina and a metropolitan school system in another southern state. The analysis technique was cross-tabulation of percentages. School contextual variables were measured by aggregating the responses of teachers in each school which had a sufficiently high rate of questionnaire return to make such a procedure seem feasible. The large sample of teachers made it possible to control race, sex, and elementary vs. secondary teaching level as a check on the generality of findings. A smaller sample would have included very few male elementary teachers, either white or Negro; and it was necessary to control these variables because the different races, sexes, and teaching levels differed in a number of ways.

Preliminary analysis indicated few relationships of any of the independent variables to professionalism, and weak interrelations among the different aspects of professionalism. (Most of the vast horde of negative results which led to this generalization are not presented in the report. They are unedifying.) The principal focus of the research was therefore shifted somewhat, with primary attention devoted to an examination of questions such as these: To what extent and in what ways is teaching a professional occupation? Why are teachers not more professional than they are? Why are schools not administered in more professionalizing ways than they are? What are the prospects of altering the situation? The main general conclusion was that teaching is not a profession, mainly because it is a predominantly feminine occupation. The primacy of family rather than work role orientations among women keeps them from being professional in outlook or behavior. School administrators behave accordingly, so that schools are run bureaucratically rather than through collegial control

by professional colleague groups. The resulting atmosphere in the schools affects male teachers, through selective recruitment into teaching of men whose orientations fit the prevailing situation and through pressures to conform. The situation is not likely to change. A chapter-by-chapter summary of the report's main outlines, which follows, will suggest some of the ways in which these conclusions were reached.

In Chapter I, sociological literature on professionalism is surveyed to arrive at a definition of the concept. There follows a discussion of the five kinds of independent, dependent, and control variables to be employed: pre-professional experience, the role-set of teachers, professional attitudes, professional behavior, and individual background characteristics. The remainder of the chapter presents the chief questions and hypotheses which guided the research, and summarizes the principal findings and conclusions in more detail than can be included in this brief summary.

Chapter II describes research methods and characteristics of the samples of teachers and college students.

Chapter III starts with a discussion of ways in which the occupation of teaching is and is not a profession, concluding that in most ways it is not one but that it offers opportunities for professionalism among individual teachers if they are professionally inclined. To explore the extent to which teachers are in fact professional, several hypotheses are tested. The hypotheses state conditions which should be true if the typical members of an occupation are professionals. They involve the prevalence of professional attitudes and behaviors among teachers and education students, the professionalizing effects of teacher education, the relation of professionalism to work satisfaction, the effects of integration into colleague groups on professionalism, the interrelations of professional characteristics, the relation of school professionalism to individual professionalism, and the combined effects of school professionalism and individual integration into colleague groups on individual professionalism. Little support is found for any of the hypotheses, and it is concluded that most teachers and schools are not professionally oriented.

Chapter IV presents descriptive data to show what kinds of individual teacher characteristics are associated with professionalism. Negroes are found to be more professional than whites in some respects but less so than others. Little relation of teachers' sex or teaching level to professionalism is found, though the men in our sample were more professional in some respects than the women, and secondary teachers more so than elementary teachers, these relationships being partially independent and cumulative. Some differences are observed between young and old teachers, between those from high and low social status backgrounds, and between those from urban and rural community origins, but in none of these instances did one group outrank the other in all aspects of professionalism. The chapter ends by isolating a category of "highly professional" teachers identified by stringent criteria and amounting to less than 10% of the sample, to see what background and situational factors were associated with being highly professional. Hardly any were.

In Chapter V, a "job" orientation is contrasted with a professional orientation, and data are presented to suggest that teachers characteristically have job orientations. A jobholder, as distinct from a professional, seeks primarily sociable and supportive working conditions. The findings support the hypothesis that teachers whose role-set relations give opportunities for sociability and protect them against harsh demands will be more satisfied with their jobs than other teachers, but not more professional. In particular, supportive and friendly behavior by the principal is the variable most strongly associated with teacher satisfaction, but is essentially unrelated to teacher professionalism.

Three main points are made in Chapter VI. First, not only the occupation of teaching as a whole, but also certain teaching fields within it, are considered more suitable for women than for men by the teachers themselves, whereas they consider administrative work and some secondary teaching fields more appropriate for men. They attribute more sex stereotyping of teaching fields to the public than to themselves. Possible effects of these sex stereotypes on teacher prestige, satisfaction, and recruitment are explored. Second, a distinctively feminine set of attitudes characterizes the occupation as a whole, and especially though not only the women in it. Few women teachers have deep commitments to lifelong teaching careers, and the large number who aspire to stop work and be full-time housewives are the least professional teachers. Women teachers, like other women semi-professionals, are characterized by compliant predispositions, a desire for friendly work atmospheres, an orientation to humanitarian service rather than to technical expertise, and a lack of colleague reference group and collegial authority orientations. All of these characteristics make teachers less professional than they would otherwise be. Third, these characteristics of the occupation and of the prevailing beliefs about it help to explain why schools are in many ways run like bureaucracies rather than organizations staffed by autonomous professionals. These points are supported by data from the study and by reference to previous research.

Chapter VII speculates pessimistically about the prospects of three conceivable strategies for professionalizing the occupation: creating more professional situations, training future teachers for professionalism, and recruiting future teachers selectively for professional predispositions. Data are then analyzed on teachers' social backgrounds as they bear on the recruitment of teachers in the future. Comparisons of backgrounds of young and old teachers, teachers of different subjects, college students majoring in education and other subjects, and education and non-education students attending elite and non-elite colleges strongly suggest that the recruitment and retention of teachers, professional or unprofessional, may become increasingly difficult. In comparison with other college graduates, teachers have continued to come disproportionately from agricultural and blue-collar families. The agricultural recruitment source has already largely disappeared. The blue-collar source is currently expanding, as non-elite colleges spring up and educational opportunities for the disadvantaged are enlarged, but this situation is temporary. Teaching has relatively little appeal to young people from the rapidly growing white-collar segments of the population. The implications of a growing gulf between teachers' and pupils' backgrounds and values, as teachers remain lower middle class and traditional while their pupils become increasingly upper middle class and alienated from tradition, are discussed.

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM: PROFESSIONALISM AMONG SCHOOL TEACHERS

In this research we seek to discover the extent and nature of professionalism among public teachers, and to identify factors related to varying degrees of teacher professionalism, on the basis of survey data gathered from samples of public school teachers and undergraduate college students. In this chapter we discuss professionalism and the components of it which we shall study, indicate the kinds of variables whose relations to it we shall examine, and suggest illustratively some of the types of hypotheses and questions we shall explore. Chapter II describes our research methods. Succeeding chapters present the research hypotheses and questions in detail, report and interpret the findings, and draw conclusions and implications for the future of professionalism among teachers.

Professionalism

Professions have traditionally been regarded as those occupations in which specialized knowledge is applied in the performance of a public service. The 1934 edition of Webster's dictionary defines a profession as "...a calling in which one professes to have acquired some special knowledge used by way either of instructing, guiding, or advising others or of serving them in some art...."[1] The 1961 Webster's dictionary maintains substantially this same definition, adding that professional knowledge requires "long and intensive preparation...."[2] The newer Webster's definition also includes an aspect of professionalism on which sociologists have laid great stress. It notes that professions maintain "by force of organization or concerted opinion high standards of achievement or conduct...."[3]

Sociologists have come increasingly to regard specialized, abstract knowledge as the core of professionalism.[4] The rendering of public service has tended to become a less central part of sociologists' definitions of the concept than it has been in traditional definitions of professionalism such as those we have quoted from the dictionary. Some writers continue to mention service as a key element of professionalism.[5] But there are, it seems to us, good reasons for de-emphasizing the rendering of service when defining what constitutes a profession.

---

[1] 1. Webster's New International Dictionary, unabridged, 2nd ed., Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1934.

[2] 2. Webster's Third New International Dictionary, unabridged, Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1961.

[3] 3. Ibid.

[4] 4. See, for example, A. M. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, The Professions, Oxford (England): Clarendon, 1933, Part III; Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964, pp. 75-93; Ida Harper Simpson, "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, 37 (1967), pp. 47-54: Talcott Parsons, "Professions," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1968, Vol. 12, pp. 536-547.

Some writers who have stressed service in defining professionalism have had in view the solo practice professions in which a client enters into a fiduciary relationship with the professional person. In these situations, it is said the professional person must be imbued with an ideal of service if he is to be trusted to put the client's welfare ahead of his own. Lewis and Maude take this view, as does Parsons when he emphasizes "collectivity orientation" in his early writings on professionalism.[6] The ideal-type professional man Parsons chooses for illustration is the solo practice physician. But ministers and university professors have worked as employees for many centuries; lawyers and physicians increasingly work in bureaucratic settings; and the new profession of research scientist almost never involves independent practice. The members of these occupational groups are, it is commonly felt, no less professional than the independent dentist or architect even though their obligations are to impersonal organizations or to external colleague groups rather than to individual clients.

There are, moreover, occupations which demand at least as much dedication to service at the expense of opportunities for personal gain as the professions require, but are not regarded as professions because they do not call for long training or abstract knowledge. Policemen and firemen are examples. They risk their lives to serve the public, while professors publish to get themselves prestige, and both of these patterns are institutionalized. Police sometimes take bribes, but so do lawyers chase ambulances and physicians split fees. In all of these instances the norm of collectivity-oriented service exists although it is violated.

---

[5] See, for example, Roy Lewis and Angus Maude, Professional People, London: Phoenix House, 1953; William J. Goode, "The Theoretical Limits of Professionalization," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, New York: Free Press, 1969, pp. 266-313.

[6] Lewis and Maude, op. cit.: Talcott Parsons, The Social System, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951, pp. 428-479. Even earlier analyzed professionalism as involving the institutionalization of unselfish behavior in his "The Professions and Social Structure," Social Forces, 17 (1939), pp. 457-467.

Consider also the case of corporation managers. They like money, but Gordon finds that their chief incentive is prestige.[7] In both of these respects they resemble professors, and they are not at all like the owner-entrepreneur businessman who is so often contrasted with the professional man. The way in which they seek prestige is through striving to maximize the welfare of their corporations: in short, through service to collectivities. Top executives value profits chiefly as a sign that they have performed this service well. Despite all this, they are not usually regarded by others as professionals, though they like to speak of themselves as a profession. The main reason seems to be that the collectivity to whose service and norms they are oriented is a specific organization, rather than some outside group such as the general public or their managerial colleagues in rival corporations. An additional reason is that management is an art, requiring wisdom and skill but not based on a codified body of abstract knowledge. This is becoming less true as business schools train future executives in theories about decision trees and the like, but it is probably safe to say that the skills required to reach the top in business remain those of the generalist, not the specialized skills of the eminent physician or scientist.

There is another reason to exclude service from the definition of professionalism, especially when studying such a group as school teachers. Orientations to service may be of fundamentally different kinds, and it makes a difference which kind of service orientation the practitioners of an occupation have. Parsons, in his analysis of professionalism, stresses what he calls affective neutrality, universalism, and functional specificity as essential elements of it.[8] These orientations are tied inextricably to the notion that professional service consists of the application of abstract knowledge. The professional person is an expert only in dealing with the kinds of problems for which his specialized knowledge equips him; i.e., his expertise is functionally specific. If he is to bring his knowledge to bear most usefully, he must remain emotionally detached from the clients or issues he deals with--i.e., affectively neutral--since emotional involvement might mar his judgment. He must apply the same universalistic criteria of judgment to all cases which are similar with respect to the abstractly conceived problems they concern, rather than being influenced by the particularistic qualities of the recepients of his services.

---

[7] Robert A. Gordon, Business Leadership in the Large Corporation, with a new preface, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961, pp. 312-328.

[8] Parsons, The Social System, loc. cit. His analysis in "The Professions and Social Structure," op. cit., was similar, though he had not at that time come up with his concept of affective neutrality. He spoke of "rationality."

There is, however, another kind of service orientation, in which the practitioner forms functionally diffuse, affectively charged relationships with his clients and is apt to treat them on the basis of these particularistic attachments. Such as orientation is especially likely to arise among groups like teachers or nurses, who are in prolonged contact with dependent or helpless clients. Parsons' analysis makes it clear that a service orientation of this kind is not professional; it is the antithesis of professionalism because it does not fit with the dedication to abstract expertise. We shall have more to say about it later, labeling it "holistic service orientation."

For these reasons we do not include the rendering of service in our definition of professions or professionalism. Instead, we define a profession as an occupation which possesses a codified body of abstract knowledge, and which maintains two patterns which appear necessary if the knowledge is to be properly used. The individual professional must be autonomous, free to structure his own work tasks and make his own decisions, since he alone is capable of deciding how best to use his knowledge in a given situation.[9] To be autonomous, he must not be subject, in the performance of his basic tasks, to commands or rules issued by bureaucratic superiors or by anyone else outside the profession. Some degree of control over him may nevertheless be needed, and the form it takes in a profession is that of control by colleagues.[10] The colleague control may be direct, as when collegial groups make decisions which bind their members

---

9. On autonomy as a hallmark of the professions, see Alexander M. Carr-Saunders, "Metropolitan Conditions and Traditional Professional Relationships," in Robert M. Fisher (ed.), The Metropolis in Modern Life, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1955, pp. 279-287; Ernest Greenwood, "Attributes of a Profession," Social Work, 2 (1957), pp. 45-55; Everett C. Hughes, Men and Their Work, New York: Free Press, 1958, pp. 78-87; Goode, op. cit.

10. On collegial control structures and on control of individual practitioners by their colleagues as essential to professionalism, see Max Weber, "Bureaucracy," in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds. and trans.), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, New York: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 236-239; A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (eds. and trans.), Max Weber: The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, New York: Oxford University Press, 1947, p. 402, and Parsons, "Introduction," pp. 58-60; Eugene Litwak, "Models of Bureaucracy That Permit Conflict," American Journal of Sociology, 67 (1961), pp. 177-184; William A. Kornhauser, Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962, p. 13; Hughes, op. cit.

to policies and procedures, or indirect, as when the individual internalizes professional norms during his training or uses colleagues as a normative reference group and source of approval during his subsequent career.[11]

A profession, then, is an occupation characterized by abstract knowledge, individual autonomy, and colleague control. Professionalism among members of an occupation is defined primarily as their orientation to knowledge, their desire for autonomy, and their use of colleagues as a reference group, and it is mainly by these criteria that we shall assess the prevalence of professionalism among teachers; but in addition, we shall look at some other factors which are related to these three main orientations. A fully professional person has an intrinsic commitment to his work and the knowledge it embodies; he is not chiefly interested in extrinsic rewards of the job such as money or sociability. Intrinsic commitment is important because without it, the individual may lose interest in keeping up with the knowledge of his profession; external control by colleagues is not enough unless the individual is internally motivated to do his work in accordance with professional standards; and without intrinsic professional commitment the individual might not demand, nor could he be entrusted with, autonomy. We shall also pay some attention to whether teachers' orientations are functionally specific, universalistic, and affectively neutral, since these orientations are, as Parsons has shown, necessary if the abstract knowledge of a profession is to be used properly. A professional situation is one in which the conditions defining a profession prevail, or in which the orientations involved in professionalism are fostered.

It is usually taken for granted by members of professions or would-be professions, and sometimes by sociologists writing about them, that professionalism is a good thing for all concerned. The truth of this assumption is by no means self-evident. It might be argued, for example, that one can serve a client best by forming diffuse, expressive attachments to him and paying attention to the client's whole person rather than only to that part of him which is learning the alphabet or being injected with medicine. Professionals undoubtedly use their autonomy sometimes in ways which benefit themselves at the expense of their clients or the public.

---

[11] On the use of colleagues as reference groups, see William J. Goode, "Community within a Community: The Professions," American Sociological Review, 22 (1957), pp. 194-200; Greenwood, op. cit.; Harold L. Wilensky, "The Professionalization of Everyone?" American Journal of Sociology, 70 (1964), pp. 137-158; Simpson, op. cit.

Jencks and Riesman combine these arguments in an indictment of the academic profession.[12] They maintain that colleague control, meaning no control by anyone except colleagues, leaves professors free to ignore everything but their narrow disciplinary specialties, thereby failing to meet their students' needs to have personal relationships with faculty members and to integrate the abstractions they are taught with the realities of the world outside. To Jencks and Riesman, autonomy means irresponsibility; the individual may be responsible to his colleagues but they as a group are irresponsible. In reply, Kateb has argued that professors are indeed irresponsible, but must be so; another term for irresponsibility is academic freedom, without which unfettered critical thinking and teaching are impossible.[13]

The arguments of Jencks and Riesman and of Kateb are more complex than our brief summaries of them, and to extend either line of argument to professions other than university teaching would take us too far afield. We argue elsewhere, in a discussion too complex to give even a hint of here, that professionalism is a good thing and that there are societal mechanisms which prevent individuals or colleague groups from misusing their atuonomy to any alarming degree.[14] Suffice it to say here that in this report, we will not examine how professions are integrated into society, but only the professionalism of members of one occupation; and that we have no proof that a professional teacher is better than an unprofessional one. Our opinion is that professionalism is desirable. A teacher who loves her work, who keeps up with the abstract knowledge in her field, who thinks for herself rather than having to be told what to do, and who continually checks the quality of her work against the professional standards she perceives her colleagues to have would seem likely, other things equal, to teach better than a teacher who does not do these things. But we cannot prove it.

Factors Related to Professionalism

Our analysis will involve five major categories or "blocks" of variables: (A) pre-professional experience, including choice of teaching as an occupation and aspects of undergraduate teacher education,

---

[12] Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1968.

[13] George Kateb, "The Campus and Its Critics," Commentary, 47 (April), pp. 40-48.

[14] Richard L. Simpson, "Imperative Control, Associationalism, and the Moral Order," in Herman Turk and Richard L. Simpson (eds.), Institutions and Social Exchange: The Sociologies of Talcott Parsons and George C. Homans, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, forthcoming.

(B) the role-set[15] of teachers, including social relationships with and attitudes toward the local community, the school principal, students, and colleagues, (C) professional attitudes, including the professional orientations we have discussed above, the presence or absence of commitment to a full-time career in education and whether the commitment is to classroom teaching or to administrative work, and satisfaction with the current job and with teaching as a career, (D) professional behavior, including behaviors presumed or hypothesized to reflect professional attitudes, such as time spent in professional reading and in voluntary attendance at professional meetings, and (E) individual background characteristics, actually a miscellaneous category including not only such things as community origin and childhood family social status but also such personal attributes as sex and age. Some of our variables do not fit neatly into any of these blocks. Examples include the race of the teacher (a personal characteristic but also, since the teaching staffs we studied were totally segregated at the time, an aspect of the job), whether the teacher worked in an elementary or a secondary school, and (if secondary) the subject she taught.[16] Appendix C lists all variables used in this report.

Usually, though not always, the variables in blocks C and D, attitudes and professional behavior, will be the dependent variables, the ones whose prevalence we are interested in assessing and explaining. Variables in blocks A and B, pre-professional experience and the role-set, will be used as independent variables hypothesized to influence professional attitudes and behavior. The individual background variables (block E) and the unclassified ones such as race and teaching level will be used sometimes as independent variables, and sometimes to establish control groups within which relations among other variables are examined.

---

[15] The concept of role-set is Merton's. See Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, 2nd ed., Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957, pp. 368-370. A similar concept was developed by Frederick L. Bates, "Position, Role, and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts," Social Forces, 34 (1956), pp. 313-321.

[16] Since most of the teachers and undergraduate education majors we studied were women, we shall use the feminine pronoun except when referring specifically to male teachers or students. Most principals were men, so we shall use the masculine pronoun to refer to the principal. The fact that most schools have predominantly female teaching staffs but male principals is, we shall argue later, of fundamental importance in understanding how teachers behave and how schools operate.

Our research is directed less to the testing of specific hypotheses than to the exploration of a set of broad questions about professionalism among teachers. Answers to the questions consist partly of sheer description of the prevalence of professional attitudes and behaviors, among teachers generally and among teachers with various personal characteristics in various kinds of schools. It is of interest, for example, to know whether black or white teachers orient more to their colleagues as a reference group, or whether rural or metropolitan teachers do more professional reading. The main purpose of the research is, however, analytical rather than descriptive. We are interested in knowing why teachers think and behave as they do. not just in knowing what they think or how they behave. When our broad orienting questions lead us to ask why things happen, we shall state hypotheses and test them. Even in seeking answers to orienting questions which ask "if" rather than "why" something is true, our primary analytical procedure will be the testing of hypotheses.

As an example, one of the broad questions we address is, "Are teachers professionals?" We might reason that in a profession, social integration into a group of colleagues should reinforce professional attitudes and exert normative pressure for professional behavior. We might therefore hypothesize that the teachers who interact most with colleagues will be the most professional in their attitudes and behaviors. If a hypothesis of this kind is supported, we might conclude that the findings give evidence that teachers are indeed professionals. If such a hypothesis is not supported, we might begin to suspect that they are not professionals, and go on to ask other questions and test other hypotheses to discover why they are not. From a series of such questions and hypotheses, we hope to learn something about the extent to which and the ways in which teachers are professional, the reasons why some are more professional than others, the work conditions which maximize professionalism, and the strategies which might be employed to increase professionalism in this occupation.

Below, underlined, are the broad orienting questions which have guided our inquiry, each followed by a brief illustrative preview of the main kinds of analysis we shall undertake, or arguments we shall advance, in an effort to answer it. The hypotheses stated are far from a complete list of those we shall test. In giving such a preview, we must necessarily anticipate some of the findings.

Are teachers professionals? If so, they will manifest high degrees of professional orientations, commitment to teaching careers, career satisfaction, and professional behavior. Among college students, a higher percentage of those planning to teach than of those not planning professional careers will have chosen their majors because of intrinsic interest in the subject matter, and the more exposure a student has had to the educational curriculum, the more professional her orientation will be. The more professional a teacher's orientations are, the more satisfied she will be with teaching as a career. Integration of teachers into colleague groups will increase professional behavior by enhancing professional orientations. The schools with the most professional situations will have the most satisfied teachers; for example, teacher satisfaction will be highest in schools whose principals allow their teachers the most autonomy.

It will turn out that teachers are not particularly professional in many respects. Individual characteristics of teachers are associated with differing degrees of professionalism.

To the extent that teachers are not professionals, what are they? To many teachers, teaching is just a job, something they do to earn money or fill time but to which they have little intrinsic professional commitment. Many of them want primarily a pleasant, easy, sociable work situation, and these features of a job are more important to them than is the encouragement the job gives them to enlarge their knowledge and apply it in professional ways. They value role-set relations more for the ease or sociability they afford than for the professional stimulation they provide. Accordingly, there are aspects of the role-set which increase teachers' job satisfaction but without increasing the professionalism of their orientations or behavior, examples being close colleague relations and principals' willingness to grant autonomy to teachers and to back them up in disputes with parents and students. In short, many of the working conditions which please teachers do not professionalize them, and the most pleased are not necessarily the most professional. These findings suggest that opportunities to apply their skills in highly professional situations are not what most teachers are primarily interested in.

Why are they this way? The main reason why so many teachers view their work more as a job than as a profession is simply that so many of them are women.[17] The fact that most teachers are women creates an atmosphere in which even the men are less professional in orientations and behavior than they might otherwise be. The men are, in fact, less professional than the women in a number of respects, partly because a large percentage of the men regard classroom teaching as a path to administrative positions rather than as a lifelong pursuit. The public is less willing to grant professional autonomy and colleague control to predominantly feminine occupational groups than to male occupations, but even if this were not so, women would be unlikely to develop professional orientations because most of them are oriented more toward family roles than toward work roles.

A number of effects and correlates of the predominantly feminine composition of the teaching force can be seen. A large percentage of female undergraduate education majors do not plan to teach continuously after they graduate, but to stop work when they marry or have children; similar expectations and a high frequency of interrupted careers are evident among the women teachers. The public stereotype of teaching, especially elementary teaching, as a feminine pursuit and of administration as more suitable for men is shared by many of the teachers themselves, of both sexes. Not only men, but many women, seem to feel that in work situations involving both sexes, the man should be the boss. Most principals are men. As a result, women teachers are generally disinclined to seek autonomy or to look to their colleagues rather than to their superiors for normative guidance and approval. Women are more service-oriented than men are, but their service orientation is of the kind which makes them seek diffuse, expressive attachments to pupils; i.e., it is not a professional orientation. Even if women are professionally inclined to start with, they are subject to competing role pressures from the family; these family pressures reduce their professionalism and probably their effectiveness.

It seems likely, though our data cannot fully demonstrate it, that the fact that most teachers are women contributes to a general set of unprofessional conditions which affect the whole occupation, men as well as women. The compliant predispositions of women teachers help to develop a habit of command in their principals, which affects the principals' dealings with all teachers regardless of sex.

---

[17] Most of the ideas in this paragraph and the next, too, are developed extensively and applied to nurses, social workers, and librarians as well as to teachers, in Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, "Women and Bureaucracy in the Semi-Professions," in Etzioni (ed.), op. cit., pp. 196-265.

Our male teachers are low in colleague reference group orientation, partly because most of their colleagues are women and partly because so many of them aspire to principalships and therefore look mainly to their superiors for approval. Neither the community, colleagues, nor principals seem willing to grant much professional autonomy to a predominantly female group such as teachers. As a result, teachers whose orientations are highly professional tend to feel that the menbers of their role-sets do not support them in their efforts to be professional. In its whole atmosphere, the typical school comes to resemble a bureaucracy, where employees are governed by rules and instructions, more than a professional organization where they govern themselves.

What might be done to professionalize teachers? We cannot really answer this question on the basis of our data, but the data make possible some informed speculation. Three lines of attack suggest themselves: to create more professional situations, to train teachers better, and to recruit them selectively, trying to entice into the field more people whose background characteristics seem conducive to professionalism. Conceivably through one or more of these strategies, educators might produce or procure a more professional teaching corps for our schools.

A professional situation is one in which professional orientations and behaviors prevail among the teachers, the teachers who are the most professional are also the most career-committed and satisfied, and their professional orientations and their ability to gain satisfaction through professional behavior are reinforced by their role-set relationships. Our data enable us to identify some variables associated with professionalism of school situations, but in general these variables are not the sorts of things one can readily manipulate. They vary in time and space but are difficult to change at a given time in a given place. Communities, students, principals, and teachers must normally accept each other as givens. Communities and even individual schools can sometimes control the kinds of principals and teachers they employ, but not always; some teachers and principals can move to different schools, though not all can; but even when these things are possible, their net effect on professionalism may be zero if some schools lose what others gain.

At a minimum, principals might find ways to reward teachers for professionalism. But they are not likely to do so if they themselves prefer authoritarian control to the granting of autonomy, and their freedom to do so is limited if their own superiors fear the kinds of maverick ideas which a few autonomous teachers might put into practice. School systems might look for attitudes favorable to professionalism when they employ principals. Advocating these things is easier than doing them, and in any case, suggestions which concern the behavior and recruitment of principals may be focusing on the wrong part of the problem, for the problem lies chiefly with the teachers. Most of them do not want to be professional, and to treat them as if they were professionally oriented might not work. We are left with our earlier conclusion that it may not be possible to create professional situations by acting directly on the variables that are associated with them.

A second conceivable strategy is to train teachers better. Our findings on undergraduate education students indicate that the present methods of training teachers do not produce professionalism. Unfortunately no one has yet discovered what alternative methods might work better. From the literature on socialization into occupations, two conclusions stand out, neither of which offers ground for optimism about improved training as a way to professionalize teachers. One conclusion is that selective recruitment into training programs and the work situation in which the trained person finds himself usually have more to do with his work orientations than the training process has. Another is that the kinds of training procedures which do have lasting effects on the trainees' orientations are not normally possible except in cloistered total institutions. Convents produce dedicated nuns, and military academies produce dedicated career officers, but training situations as rigorous as these reduce drastically the number of people who are willing to be trained. Even a stiffening of requirements within the colleges which now prepare teachers might reduce the supply of trainees; our findings and those of other researchers suggest that many of the people who now become teachers would be frightened off if the preparation were made more intellectually demanding.

The third possible professionalizing strategy lies in selective recruitment into the occupation. Our findings show professionalism more related to some individual background characteristics than to preprofessional experiences or on-the-job role-set relationships. Special inducements might attract more poeple with such characteristics into teaching. But apart from the difficulty of implementing a selective recruitment program, even identifying the background characteristics to look for is not simple. Our data show that the teachers of a given race, community origin, or childhood social status may be the most professional in some ways but the least professional in other ways.

Moreover, in the future it may become difficult to recruit enough teachers of any kind, let alone teachers from specific kinds of backgrounds. Teaching has traditionally been an easily available channel of social mobility, into the city or up the ladder. It will remain one for a while, and one result will be that a growing percentage of teachers will be black teachers, whom our data show to be more professional than whites in some respects but less so in others. But an occupation which has traditionally recruited upward mobile rural and working-class people may be headed for severe recruitment problems in an increasingly urban and middle-class society. The changes in our occupational structure simultaneously dry up the rural and working-class recruitment sources, and provide alternative routes into the middle class. Country girls no longer have to become teachers to get off the farm. It is less and less the case that blacks have to become teachers to get out of the slum. Our society's ever-widening avenues of opportunity are beneficial for such groups as these, but may make it hard to get enough teachers of any kind at all, let alone highly professional ones, unless the occupation can somehow be made more attractive to men. The feminine sex stereotype of teaching now keeps men out, as do the low salaries. The stereotype might gradually disappear if the salaries were enormously increased, and if this happened, the occupation might eventually become more professional because less feminine.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH METHODS

We obtained our data from questionnaires administered to college students in North Carolina and to public school teachers in two southern states. The principal analysis technique is cross-tabulation of percentages. Data from secondary sources and results of previous research are also brought to bear in some of our analysis, but we rely chiefly on our questionnaire data.

The Samples of Students and Teachers

To get data from students, questionnaires were administered in 1963 to students in all four-year colleges and universities in North Carolina which had complied with a request to send us their latest catalogs. These included fifteen predominantly white and six predominantly Negro institutions. All assistant professors listed in the catalogs were asked by mail to administer the questionnaires in their 9:00 A.M. classes on a given day, if they taught undergraduates at this hour. All students attending the classes of cooperating faculty members at the appointed hour were asked to fill out the questionnaires, and we assume that virtually all of them did so.

We are indebted to Snell Putney for explaining to us a roughly similar procedure which he and Russell Middleton had used to obtain a sample of college students. Assistant professors rather than senior faculty were asked to cooperate on the supposition that they would more likely be teaching undergraduates and that they might be more inclined to cooperate. Nearly all of them did cooperate, by administering the questionnaires or by informing us that they taught no undergraduates at the designated hour. We chose the 9:00 hour since a large percentage of classes at that time in universities are for undergraduates, and we limited the questionnaire distribution to a single time so that no student would complete two questionnaires or be forced to miss two normal classes.

The virtue of this sampling procedure is that it is inexpensive and simple. The sample we obtained was not random, but we have no reason to suspect any systematic bias in the kinds of students selected, except that we missed the sick and the lazy who were cutting class. We excluded special students and graduate students--i.e., all who were not undergraduates--from the sample retained for analysis in this report. The analysis sample included 3189 students: 1495 white men, 1187 white women, 120 Negro men, and 387 Negro women, of whom 930 were freshmen, 742 were sophomores, 856 were juniors, and 661 were seniors.

In sampling teachers, our hope was to get data from as many of North Carolina's nearly 40,000 public school teachers as we could, and to supplement these with data from a large city in another southern state because North Carolina contains no real metropolis. We did not expect to get a random or complete sample of North Carolina teachers or schools, for we expected that many of the state's school superintendents, whose help was required, would be unwilling to cooperate. To our mixed pleasure and chagrin, nearly all the superintendents agreed to help us, thereby putting at our disposal a potentially larger number of teachers than we could possibly reach with the resources at our disposal. Our decision was a compromise in which we got to as many teachers as we could, in school systems representing a broad geographic spectrum of North Carolina, with some oversampling of the state's larger urban systems and the addition of the big-city system in another state. We promised all superintendents that their school systems would not be identified in our analysis, so we shall not identify the big city except to say that it had a larger population than any city in North Carolina and was in a state which seceded from the Union in 1861. Details of our procedures follow.

In the early spring of 1962, the superintendents of schools in 164 of the then-existing 174 school systems in North Carolina were sent letters explaining the nature of the study and asking them to help us by sending lists of all schools and teachers in their systems.[1] (Some systems were omitted because their schools were already inundated with survey research.) Once the lists were received, the principal of each school was sent a letter explaining the study and asking him to encourage his teachers to participate. Letters were sent to the principals about two weeks before their teachers were to receive the questionnaires. Questionnaires were mailed individually to the teachers, at their school addresses.

Before the superintendents were contacted, the December 1961 issue of the North Carolina Public School Bulletin, an official publication of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, carried a brief article describing the research.[2] Information about the study appeared in some newspapers at about the time we were writing to the principals and teachers in their communities. In our letters to superintendents, principals, and teachers we stressed the scientific and anonymous nature of the research and the fact that it was sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education and the University of North Carolina and had the approval of, but no official connection with, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, the North Carolina Education Association (white), and the North Carolina Teachers' Association (Negro). The willingness of these agencies to place their stamps of legitimacy upon the study was of great help at a time when school desegregation was a sensitive political issue and any research on schools might appear to involve some danger for local school administrators. All but nine of the 164 superintendents to whom we wrote furnished us with lists of teachers.

---

[1] In this description we have drawn upon and occasionally quoted (by permission) from the account of North Carolina sampling procedures in Joy Rochelle Gold, "The Effect of Administrative Atmosphere on the Role of the School Teacher," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1964.

[2] We are indebted to Dr. J. E. Miller of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and to Messrs. L. H. Jobe and V. M. Mulholland of the North Car-lina School Bulletin for giving our research this publicity among school personnel.

We mailed questionnaires to teachers in the alphabetical order of their city or county school systems, until the "J's" were reached. At that point, the school year was nearing an end. We departed from the alphabetical procedure and used the time remaining to reach the larger cities not yet reached. Each teacher was sent a questionnaire with a covering letter, a stamped return envelope, and a stamped post card. She was asked to sign and return the post card separately when she returned the unsigned questionnaire, so that the questionnaire would be anonymous but we would know whether she had returned it. Nonrespondents were sent two follow-up communications if the first did not bring results, a reminder post card and a second questionnaire with return envelope and post card.

The returned North Carolina questionnaires were coded in the summer of 1962. All coders' work was checked for two weeks while the coding was in progress. Error in coding was well below one per cent. In addition, the code sheets of the coders who had made the most errors were checked in their entirety and corrected. The data were punched onto IBM cards from the code sheets, and the punching was verified.[3]

A similar method was used to obtain data from teachers in the big city outside North Carolina, in 1963. The superintendents in two cities were asked to cooperate, one did so by sending a list of his teachers and their schools, and the remaining procedures were the same as those followed in North Carolina. The local university auspices, publicity, and approval of the research by state educational and teachers' organizations were evidently valuable assets in North Carolina, for the response rate was much lower in the metropolis outside the state where comparable assets were lacking.

Questionnaires were sent to more than 22,000 teachers, in county or city schools located in 60 or North Carolina's 100 counties and city in a different stata.[4] (The latter will henceforth be referred to as "metropolitan" teachers.) The North Carolina schools sampled were distributed quite evenly across the state, and gave us a sample which was broadly representative of the state although it was not random and drew from nearly all the state's largest cities but from a smaller proportion of its rural counties. One or more teachers in 94.2% of the North Carolina schools and in 96.6% of the metropolitan schools contacted sent back usable questionnaires.

---

[3] Angell G. Beza of the Institute for Research in Social Science wrote the coding instructions, devised the procedures, and gave overall supervision to the entire data-processing operation just described.

The percentages of teachers who returned questionnaires left something to be desired. Return rates were 43.3% for all teachers contacted, 49.7% for North Carolina whites, 32.3% for North Carolina Negroes, 33.1% for metropolitan whites, and 27.1% for metropolitan Negroes. The reminder post card and second questionnaire sent to nonrespondents did not greatly augment the returns from the first mailing, so further follow-ups seemed unlikely to have much effect. About 15% of the schools had return rates below 30% while a similar number had return rates above 70%. In one county, the rate of return from every school was unusually high. These differences suggest that principals and superintendents had a lot to do with the rates of return. Presumably some expressed skepticism about the value of such research, others said nothing at all, and others encouraged or even ordered their teachers to cooperate. This last may have happened in the county where all schools produced high return rates.

The return rates from North Carolina communities of varying size were substantially the same, a fact which may mean that the low return rate from the metropolis stemmed from the absence of local sponsorship rather than from a tendency to teachers in big cities to cooperate in surveys. The metropolitan superintendent seems to have played no role beyond that of sending us the list of teachers and schools--which is all we had asked of him--for the metropolitan return rates ranged from zero to 100% in different schools. Teachers in elementary schools, elementary-junior high combined schools, secondary schools, and consolidated schools spanning the grades from elementary through high school were very similar in their return rates. We cannot compare return rates of men and women, for we have no way of knowing the sex of nonrespondents. Most lists of teachers did not indicate their sex, and first names can be misleading or ambiguous as to sex.

---

[4] The return rate figures given below for teachers other than North Carolina whites are estimates based on a procedure reported by Gold, _op. cit._, pp. 32-33, to arrive at a return rate for North Carolina whites adjusted to account for the fact that some who received questionnaires were not actually teachers but were librarians, guidance counselors, or other non-teaching personnel. We report her figures for North Carolina whites. We have not indicated exactly how many questionnaires were sent in order to avoid giving information which might identify the metropolis.

There is reason to believe that the low and varying rates of return did not materially affect the conclusions drawn from the research. As a check on possible distorting effects of low and varying return rates, we extracted a subsample of teachers, classified them by return rates of their schools, and counted marginal percentage distributions of a large number of our variables. We also controlled the return rates of teachers' schools and looked at some of the main relationships between variables we were interested in exploring. These checking operations indicated that the return rates made very little difference, and no difference of a systematic kind which would bias the findings in a given direction. Metropolitan teachers differed in a number of ways from North Carolina teachers, and whites from Negroes, but for reasons other than their different rates of questionnaire return.

The Questionnaires and Variables

Apendixes A and B give questionnaires, and Appendix C give the variables derived from them. Not all the variables are used in this report. Some were used in student M.A. and Ph.D. theses, others will be used in continuing analysis of the data beyond what is reported here, and some seemed unpromising on the basis of early analysis and were thenceforth disregarded.

Some questionnaire items were straightforward, such as those which asked about the respondent's sex, parents' education, and the like. Others, including a large percentage of the items in the student questionnaire, were taken from previous research in which the author had participated. Still others, mainly in the teacher questionnaire, were taken or adapted from items used in research previously reported by other authors. Some items were sharpened, added, or discarded on the basis of a series of preliminary depth interviews conducted by Joy R. Gold.[5]

Forty-eight of these interviews were conducted in the summers of 1960 and 1961. Most interviews were teachers attending the University of North Carolina summer school in Chapel Hill to renew their certificates. Some were former teachers who had left the occupation because of dissatisfaction with it. Several teachers refused to be interviewed. One of these said that she feared lack of anonymity and possible reprisal, and others said that they opposed social science in principle. ("I don't believe in averages or statistics;" "You can't treat human beings as numbers;" "I don't believe in determinism and prediction;" etc.) Most people who were approached cooperated willingly, however, submitting to interviews ranging from two to seven hours, the modal time being two hours. One interviewee later reported that as a result of having been interviewed, she increased the return rate when our questionnaires reached her school by reassuring some of her colleagues that no harm would come to them from their participating in the study. Some of this information about teachers' unwillingness or reluctance to take part in the study may help to explain the low questionnaire return rates.

---

[5] The following description of these interviews is based on Gold, op. cit., pp. 42-44.

Most variables are measured with single items. In combining some items to form indexes, our guiding principles of index construction were those of Lazarsfeld. He has shown that when two or more items appear to be measuring essentially the same underlying phenomenon, when any two of them relate similarly to third or "outside" variables, and when their relations to each other are moderately positive, they can fruitfully be combined into an index which will be more strongly related to outside variables than any of the single items is, thereby, presumably, reflecting the underlying phenomenon better than any single one of them does.[6] Following these principles and using data on a subsample of the teachers, we combined numerous sets of items into potential indexes and ran them against each other and against third variables, to select the indexes we have used. This procedure was necessary to establish the dichotomous or trichotomous cutting points for items incorporated into indexes, as well as to make sure that the items fitted together well.[7]

Some of our variables are "contextual," with respondents classified by the prevailing response patterns in their schools. Appendix D gives a general discussion of contextual analysis and the way in which our contextual measures were constructed.

Analysis Procedures

The basic analytical technique is cross-tabulation of percentages, often multivariate. In nearly all instances when we report relations between variables found in the total sample, we have duplicated the tables with race, sex, and (for teachers) elementary vs. secondary teaching level controlled. Often we have controlled other variables as well, if we had reason to suspect that the original relationship might be spurious--i.e., an artifact of something else's being related to the independent and dependent variables--or if we thought that the lumping of all teachers together might be obscuring relationships which would be found in some categories of them. To report all of these elaborate control tables would require a document rivaling the Chicago telephone directory in size, so we will not usually present results for teachers in the various control categories. The reader may assume, however, that unless we say so, the relationships we report are upheld within the various subcategories of teachers.

---

[6] Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Problems in Methodology," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell (eds.), Sociology Today, New York: Basic Books, 1959, pp. 60-67.

[7] Charles C. Gordon did much of the work in this process of index formation, but the present author made the decisions. Ideally we should have constructed the indexes with data from an independent sample of respondents before using them with the sample we had, to avoid the risk of building research conclusions into the process of index construction, but this was not feasible.

We have not employed tests of statistical significance of differences, for two reasons. The main reason is that the data do not meet the assumptions of random sampling which such tests require. Another reason is that with an N of nearly 10,000 a relationship is likely to be statistically significant even though it is so small as to have no practical meaning.

CHAPTER III

ARE TEACHERS PROFESSIONALS?

Two kinds of questions can be asked about the professionalism of an occupation. The first concerns the extent to which the occupation as a group is organized as a profession and is accorded professional status by the public. The second concerns the extent to which individual members of the occupation have professional characteristics.

As an occupational group, teaching appears to be more professional than some occupations but less so than others.[1] It resembles the full-fledged professions such as law and medicine in some ways. For example, it trains its practitioners in professional schools located in universities, it has a national association with a code of ethics (though the association is often said to be dominated by administrators rather than teachers), and its practitioners must be licensed (though temporary certificates are often issued to people not fully qualified for certification, and people trained to teach one subject are often assigned other subjects to teach). Teaching shares these attributes with the full professions, but so do some clearly nonprofessional occupations. There are university-affiliated schools of hotel management, national associations of businessmen with codes of ethics, and licensing of workers in such fields as taxi driving.

More important, teaching as an occupation falls short of full professionalism because it lacks a highly developed specialized knowledge base and the public legitimacy and autonomy which such a base would bring. Teachers purvey knowledge which others have developed. There

---

1. This discussion draws from a number of sources, mainly from Myron Lieberman, Education as a Profession, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956; Eliot Freidson, "Client Control and Medical Practice," American Journal of Sociology, 65 (1960), pp. 374-382; Philip H. Ennis and Howard W. Winger (eds.), Seven Questions about the Profession of Librarianship, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, especially the contributions by William J. Goode, "The Librarian: From Occupation to Profession?" pp. 8-22, and by Peter H. Rossi, "Discussion," pp. 82-83; Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organization, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964; Harold L. Wilensky, "The Professionalization of Everyone?" American Journal of Sociology 70 (1964), pp. 137-185; Ida Harper Simpson, "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, 37 (1967), pp. 47-54; Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, New York: Free Press, 1969, especially the chapters by Dan C. Lortie, "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," pp. 1-53, and by William J. Goode, "The Theoretical Limits of Professionalism," pp. 266-313.

are theories of education per se--i.e., of how to teach--but these tend to come from philosophy, from institutionalized ideology and folklore, or from research sometimes done by professors of education but usually using concepts and methods borrowed from other fields, chiefly psychology. In this respect the field of education resembles some other not quite professional fields, such as city planning, whose knowledge base is a mixture of architecture, engineering, sociology, economics, and political science and which has yet to develop theories all its own which the public takes seriously. Lacking a socially recognized specialized knowledge base, teaching tends to be subject to the authority of nonteachers. Boards of education control curricula; hospital boards control some features of hospital administration but they do not tell surgeons how or when to operate. Teachers do not establish the criteria for their own licensing, and in many states they are explicitly excluded from the licensing boards or required by law to be in a minority on such boards. As is also true in the feminine semi-professions of nursing, librarianship, and social work, success in education means leaving behind the application of special skills in work with clients and moving into administration. This is not true in full professions; lawyers, physicians, and university professors reach the pinnacle of success by doing conspicuously well the specialized things they have been trained to do, not by becoming generalist administrators. All of this means that teachers do not have available to them the career progression found in full-fledged professions, through which an elite few enter a privileged inner circle with only each other as audience and reference group and with virtual immunity from control by laymen.

Teaching would thus seem to be a semi-profession, not a profession, but it does afford more opportunities than most occupations for individuals to think and behave in professional ways. If the occupation is not a profession, members of it can nevertheless be professionals. In this chapter we will consider the second of the two questions raised at the beginning, the extent to which teachers are professionals. We will do this by stating a series of hypotheses which we would expect to be true if teachers are professionals, and testing the hypotheses with our data on North Carolina and metropolitan teachers. The dependent variables will concern the several aspects of professionalism discussed in Chapter I: specialized knowledge orientation, orientation to autonomy and to the collective power of the colleague group, the use of colleagues as the main occupational reference group, the absence of what we have called the "holistic service orientation" whose presence indicates a lack of universalism and affective neutrality, intrinsic work commitment and career satisfaction, and behaviors reflecting some of these orientations.

Prevalence of Professional Attitudes and Behaviors

Table III-1 shows the percentages of teachers in the sample who reported holding a variety of professional attitudes and engaging in behaviors one would expect of a professional person. The distributions of

TABLE III-1. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINETEEN VARIABLES

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	%	(N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	62	(9424)
Favored education required of teachers (19: 4,5)	68	(9382)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	40	(9545)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	53	(9063)
Did not oppose controversial activity (104: 1,2)	73	(9529)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	27	(8606)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	40	(9099)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	15	(9223)
Not bothered by giving an F (B69: 1)	19	(9459)
Became teachers because interested in the work (118:4)	49	(9210)
Stayed in teaching because liked the work (26: C12)	84	(9109)
High central life interest index (32: 2)	24	(8532)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	48	(7894)
Very high career satisfaction (38: 1)	35	(9438)
Read in subject matter ten or more hours a month (14: 4,5)	46	(9460)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	34	(9414)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1*)	18	(9609)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	45	(8630)
Highly professional (76)	8	(9369)

*Questionnaire item not listed in Appendix C.

these professional characteristics among Negro and white, male and female, elementary and secondary, and young and old teachers are reported in the next chapter. The variable numbers and designated responses or index scores refer to the numbers given in the list of variables in Appendix C.

Lacking comparable data from members of other occupations, it is not possible to say how teachers compare with people in other occupations in these respects. The literature does provide comparable data concerning two of the nineteen variables, though the questions asked were not exactly the same, and neither of these comparisons makes teachers look overly professional.

By our index of occupational reference group orientations, 27% of the teachers were oriented to colleagues rather than to students or administrative superiors. Wilensky found that the comparable percentages were 81% among professors and 51% among lawyers, but only 18% among engineers, when he asked the following question: "Here are some groups that inevitably judge the quality of professional performance. Whose judgment should count most when your overall professional performance is assessed?"[2]

In response to our question, "Speaking for yourself, how satisfying has teaching been as a career," 35% of the teachers described it as "the most satisfying career I can realistically imagine." Blauner summarizes studies which show that 91% of mathematicians, 89% of physicists and biologists, 86% of chemists, 83% of lawyers, and 82% of journalists said that they would choose the same kind of work if they were starting their careers again.[3] The same was true of 52% of skilled printers and paper workers, 41% of skilled automobile workers and skilled steelworkers, 31% of textile workers, 21% of unskilled steelworkers, and 16% of unskilled auto workers.

These figures on manual workers suggest that the question we asked presented a more stringent definition of career satisfaction than

---

[2] Wilensky, op. cit., p. 152.

[3] Robert Blauner, "Occupational Differences in Work Satisfaction," in Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson (eds.), Social Organization and Behavior: A Reader in General Sociology, New York: Wiley, 1964, p. 284. Blauner's study originally appeared in Walter Galenson and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Labor and Trade Unionism: An Interdisciplinary Reader, New York: Wiley, 1960, pp. 339-360. The data he cites are from "The Fortune Survey," Fortune, May 1947, pp. 5-12, and June 1947, pp. 5-10; "The Scientists: A Group Portrait," Fortune, October 1948, pp. 106-112; "The U. S. Bar," Fortune, May 1939, p. 176; and Leo Rosten, The Washington Correspondents, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1938, p. 347.

Blauner's question about choosing the same work again, for it seems unlikely that nearly as many cotton mill workers as school teachers would consider their occupations the "most satisfying" they could "realistically imagine." Perhaps more comparable are two other questions we asked, the responses to which we counted only in a subsample of 1000 of our 9668 teachers. Asked whether they would advise a son of theirs, and a daughter of theirs, to become teachers, somewhat more than half said that they would advise the son to be a teacher, and more than four-fifths said that they would so advise the daughter. The percentages of teachers in different race and sex categories who said that they would give this advice were: of white men, 11% would definitely advise sons to be teachers, an additional 44% would probably advise sons, 30% would definitely advise daughters, 51% would probably advise daughters; of white women, 16% would definitely and 33% would probably advise sons, 39% would definitely and 51% probably advise daughters; of Negro men, 14% would definitely and 41% probably advise sons, 21% would definitely and 52% probably advise daughters; of Negro women, 22% would definitely and 35% probably advise sons, 30% would definitely and 40% probably advise daughters. This left nearly half advising sons against teaching careers and nearly a fifth advising daughters against them, and can probably be taken to indicate less career satisfaction among teachers than among scientists, lawyers, and journalists, though not necessarily less than among skilled printers or steelworkers.

Some other findings shown in Table III-1 deserve comment although we have no data even roughly comparable on other occupations. Only 49% of the teachers said that they had chosen to be teachers because they expected the work to be interesting. Many more than this, 84%, gave liking of the work as their reason for having remained teachers, but the alternatives in the latter case were that they had remained teachers for money or prestige, and teaching is not noted for providing much of either of these. Only 46% claimed to read about their subject matter as much as ten hours a month. Ten hours a month works out to less than a half hour a day, not counting weekends. Only 18% said that they consulted colleagues often about teaching problems, *but the question unfortunately* did not specify how often was "often." In general, the responses to these questions do not give the impression of a group of people aflame with professional enthusiasm.

Professionalism and Professionalization of Education Students

If people who choose to become teachers are professional in their motivation, and if the process of teacher education serves to instill professionalism in them, several things should be true: (1) Among college students, a higher percentage of those planning to be teachers than of those studying for other occupations--many of them nonprofessional--will have chosen their major subjects and their careers because of intrinsic interest in the subject matter. (2) Education majors and, among them, those who actually plan to have careers in education, will think and act more like adult professionals than will students of other subjects. (3) The more exposure an education student has had to the teacher training program, the more his attitudes and behavior will be like those of professionals. (4) Exposure to the occupational training program will have a more professionalizing effect on education majors, and, within this group, on those actually planning careers in education, than on students of other subjects. Table III-2 deals with the first two of these hypotheses, and Table III-3 with the third and fourth.

From Table III-2 it cannot be said that the education majors we studied were either more or less professionally inclined than non-education majors, or that within the education major group, the career planners were consistently more professionally oriented than were the ones who were majoring in the subject but not planning careers in it. The table classifies students by major subject--education vs. other--and education majors by whether they planned careers in the field. How the classification (variable #303C) was obtained is described in Appendix C. The percentages in the table show how many students in each of the three categories reported the attitudes and behaviors listed at the left.

In evaluating the findings of this table, and of others later, a difference of 5% or more in the dependent variable between categories of the independent variable will be regarded as meaningful. Differences smaller than this will be taken to indicate that no relationship has been shown. The table does not show separate figures for white male, Negro male, white female, and Negro female students, but the discussion of findings will go into the extent to which relationships found in the total sample were upheld in these race and sex subcategories. In inspecting relationships within control subcategories such as these, only the direction of relationships, not their magnitude, will be considered. Elementary vs. secondary teaching level--i.e., grades 1-6 vs. grades 7-12--will be controlled in later tables involving teachers, so that in the tables on teachers any relationships observed in the total sample will be checked within eight race-sex-level categories to see if they persist.

Table III-2 shows that a larger percentage of non-education than of education majors had chosen their intended occupations because of intrinsic interest in the work. When race and sex groups were examined separately, this relationship persisted among whites but not among Negroes. The education career planners were the least intrinsically motivated in all four race-sex categories, but among NM and NF[4] students the education

---

[4] Here, and hereafter, we use initials to designate race, sex, and (for teachers) teaching level. W=white, N=Negro, M=male, F=female, E=elementary, S=secondary. Thus NM and NF mean, respectively, Negro male and Negro female, and so on.

TABLE III-2. PROFESSIONALLY RELEVANT ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS OF STUDENT EDUCATION MAJORS PLANNING CAREERS IN EDUCATION, OF EDUCATION MAJORS NOT PLANNING CAREERS IN EDUCATION, AND OF STUDENTS NOT MAJORING IN EDUCATION

Attitudes and Behaviors	Education Career Planners		Education Non-Career Planners		Non-Education Majors	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Chose occupation because the work would be interesting (118C)	47	(439)	50	(784)	56	(1781)
Said that no other occupation would suit them as well as the one they expected to go into (228C)	65	(429)	43	(760)	47	(1622)
Expected to continue working after having children (229C; asked of women only)	56	(256)	12	(646)	22	(616)
Studied five hours a day or more (215C)	40	(449)	45	(794)	38	(1804)
Wanted very much to be though of as serious students (217C)	51	(449)	43	(794)	44	(1806)
Had grade average of B- or better in previous semester (219C)	44	(448)	42	(792)	38	(1799)
Were oriented to colleagues as occupational reference group (33C)	16	(121)	12	(203)	Not asked	

non-career planners were slightly more intrinsically motivated than were the non-education students. Thus the findings on reasons for choice of occupations give no evidence that education majors rated high in professionalism, and the education career planners were the least professional students of all. An incidental finding is that all six race comparisons, involving the two sexes within the three career plan categories, found whites exceeding Negroes by 5% or more in the percentages who had chosen their intended occupations because of interest in the work. The sexes hardly differed.

The findings on variables 228C and 229C appear to present a different picture. Education career planners led by a wide margin in saying that no other occupation would suit them as well as the one they expected to enter, and (among women) in expecting to work continuously after graduation even if they had children. Education non-career planners trailed in the latter respect and were similar to non-education majors in the former respect. But the non-education majors were not classified by whether they expected to have lifetime careers in the occupations they were studying for, and the education majors were, so that these figures do not give an accurate comparison of education and other students. When the two categories of education majors are combined, it turns out that they did not differ from the non-education majors in either of these two variables. In answering the question about anticipated career enthusiasm (variable 228C), 51% of all education majors and 47% of the rest said that no other occupation would suit them as well. The women's career commitment responses showed 24% of women majoring in education and 22% of other women expecting continuous careers. Thus in these two variables, education students prove to have been essentially the same as other students when the career planners and nonplanners are combined, as they must be for a proper comparison with non-education majors.

From the three items on studiousness shown in Table III-2, it cannot be inferred that education majors were either more or less studious than non-education majors, or that career-planning education students differed from non-career planners. The career planners were the most likely to say that they wanted to be thought of as serious students, but they did not carry through this statement in behavior, for their study habits and grades were substantially the same as those of other students. The findings on studiousness within separate race and sex groups are a hodgepodge with no clear patterns and an occasional bizarre twist. For example, NF career planners were the topmost group in wanting to be considered serious students, 67% of them expressing this desire as contrasted with only 35% among WM non-career planners at the other extreme, but their grades were among the lowest reported by any subcategory of students.

Any findings on occupational reference group orientations of students are of dubious meaning, since we unfortunately used a procedure to measure reference groups which succeeded in eliminating most of the sample. As is described in Appendix C, one of the steps used to arrive at variable

33C was to classify the respondent by which group he said he was oriented to the most in answering three questions, A70 through A72 of the student questionnaire. If a respondent said that more than one group was "most important," he was eliminated from the sample for purposes of this variable, and a distressingly large number of students were eliminated in this way. For whatever the findings are worth in view of this shrinkage in the sample, they show no meaningful difference between the career-planning and non-career planning education students. The questions were not asked of non-education majors.

All in all, the findings of Table III-2 add up to negative results with respect to the first two of our four hypotheses about professionalism among students. The question about reason for occupational choice showed education students less intrinsically motivated than other students, and education career planners the least intrinsically motivated of all--a finding the opposite of the hypothesis. But the three categories of students answered the other six questions much the same. The hypotheses are not supported but neither are their opposites.

Table III-3 tests the third and fourth of the four hypotheses that were stated at the beginning of this section. The hypotheses are that exposure to occupational training has a professionalizing effect, more among students of education than of other subjects, and more among education career planners than among non-career planners. Exposure to training is measured in two ways, by the numbers of professors in their major subjects the students said they knew well and by the numbers of courses they had taken in their major subjects. The results are not wholly consistent, but in general, the hypotheses fare poorly.

The number of courses taken in the major subject was not related to any of the three dependent variables examined in any of the three categories of students. The number of professors known was not related to the amount of study by any group of students. This leaves some instances in which the number of professors known was related to the dependent variables, one set of comparisons going against the hypothesis of professionalization through training exposure or apprenticeship, and one finding going in favor of the hypothesis.

The figures at the top of the table run counter to the hypotheses. They show knowledge of professors unrelated to anticipated career enthusiasm among education career planning, related positively to it among education non-career planners, and related to it positively and more strongly among the non-education majors. Our hypotheses would have it the other way around. Among the education non-career planners, the direction of relationship shown for the total sample was the same among women students of both races but was reversed among men of both races, so the relation of knowing professors to anticipated career enthusiasm cannot be accepted as generally true of education non-career planners. The relationship did prevail in all four race-sex groups of non-education majors, the difference being 5% or more in each instance.

TABLE III-3. CAREER ENTHUSIASM AND PLANS, AMOUNT OF DAILY STUDY, AND OCCUPATIONAL REFERENCE GROUPS OF STUDENT EDUCATION MAJORS PLANNING CAREERS IN EDUCATION, OF EDUCATION MAJORS NOT PLANNING CAREERS IN EDUCATION, AND OF STUDENTS NOT MAJORING IN EDUCATION, BY NUMBER OF PROFESSORS IN MAJOR SUBJECT KNOWN WELL AND BY NUMBER OF COURSES TAKEN IN MAJOR SUBJECT

Attitudes and Behaviors by Exposure to Professors and to Subject	Education Career Planners		Education Non-Career Planners		Non-Education Majors	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Said no other occupation would suit as well as the one planned (228C) among those who:						
Knew two or more professors well (124C)	64	(261)	45	(413)	50	(842)
Knew one professor or none well (124C)	67	(168)	40	(347)	43	(780)
Had taken six or more courses (210C)	64	(276)	44	(426)	46	(843)
Had taken five or fewer courses (210C)	68	(162)	42	(339)	47	(797)
Studied five hours a day or more (215C) among those who:						
Knew two or more professors well	59	(263)	55	(416)	61	(888)
Knew one professor or none well	61	(170)	55	(353)	62	(865)
Had taken six or more courses	60	(278)	56	(429)	62	(902)
Had taken five or fewer courses	58	(163)	54	(346)	62	(880)
Were oriented to colleagues as occupational reference group (33C) among those who:						
Knew two or more professors well	23	(71)	13	(103)	Not asked	
Knew one professor or none well	5	(42)	11	(92)	Not asked	
Had taken six or more courses	17	(71)	12	(100)	Not asked	
Had taken five or fewer courses	14	(49)	12	(98)	Not asked	

The findings concerning professors known well and reference group orientations are as hypothesized. No relation was observed among non-career planners but a very strong relationship was found among education career planners. This relationship was upheld among WM, WF, NM, and NF students, and therefore can probably be accepted as valid; but the N's involved were quite small, especially in the control subcategories. The 18% difference in the total sample would have disappeared if seven students had answered differently, and a shift by one student in each male subcategory would have reversed the relationship in these groups. Still, we should probably not argue with an 18% difference upheld in four out of four control categories.

To sum up the findings of Table III-3, they show one relationship in the direction hypothesized, one in the wrong direction, and four instances where no difference was evident. Together, they do not support the hypotheses. There is little or no evidence of the kind of professionalizing effect of apprenticeship or exposure to training which was observed by Becker and Carper in their study of physiologists.[5] The physiologists they studied came into graduate school wishing they could be doctors instead of physiologists, most of them having been rejected by medical schools. After a period of work in the lab under supervision of faculty members, they had become enthusiastic future physiologists and had learned to look with a certain disdain on the medical profession, much as sociologists look down on social workers or physicists on engineers. The education majors we studied began their study with little enthusiasm, and stayed that way.

Professionalism and Satisfaction

If teachers are generally professional in outlook and if the settings where they look afford opportunities to exercise their professionalism, we would predict three things: (1) The more professional a teacher is, the more likely she will be highly satisfied with teaching as a career. Table III-4 tests this hypothesis. (2) The more professional the general atmosphere of a school is, the more satisfied with their jobs in that school the teachers in it will be. Table III-5 tests this hypothesis. (3) The more professionally oriented a college student is, the more enthusiastic she will be about her anticipated career; this will be truer of education than of non-education majors, and among education majors it will be truer of career planners than of non-career planners. Table III-6 tests this hypothesis. The tables offer scant support for any of the three hypotheses, and do not give evidence that teachers as a group are professional people.

---

[5] Howard S. Becker and James W. Carper, "The Development of Identification with an Occupation," American Journal of Sociology, 61 (1956), pp. 289-298.

Table III-4 can be summarized briefly. The percentages indicate how many teachers indicated very high career satisfaction, among those giving the responses shown at the left to questions measuring professional attitudes and behaviors. Whenever the category of teachers listed first with respect to a given variable indicated the most career satisfaction, the hypothesis was supported; whenever the group listed last with respect to a variable indicated the most satisfaction, this finding went counter to the hypothesis. An absence of any meaningful (5%) difference also fails to support the hypothesis, which states that the most professional teachers should have the most career satisfaction.

Teachers who were the most professional in knowledge orientation (variables 18 and 19) and in two aspects of professional behavior (variable 15 and item C61) reported the most career satisfaction, thereby lending support to the hypothesis. These relationships persisted within race-sex-level control categories, except that the relation of favoring educational requirements for teachers (variable 19) to career satisfaction was reversed among WME and NFS teachers. (In some instances the control comparisons could not be made among NME because the N's were too small, too small being arbitrarily defined as 24 or fewer.)

On the other hand, running against the hypothesis, teachers who were low in orientation to autonomy and colleague group power (variables 25, 104) and those who were high in holistic service orientation (variables 23 and 162, item B69) were the most satisfied. These relationships also were upheld with great consistency in the race-sex-level control subcategories. The direction of relationships was not reversed in any category with respect to bureaucratic submission or attitude toward controversial activity, and the findings concerning the three holistic service orientation variables were reversed only once apiece in seven or eight control comparisons--seven or eight depending on whether there were enough NME's in all categories of the independent variable to allow the comparisons.

Reference group orientation was not related to career satisfaction. Neither was any of the other variables not mentioned above.

Table III-5 fails to support the hypothesis that teachers in schools which schools were the most professional in atmosphere would be the most satisfied with their jobs. The measures of school atmosphere are aggregated responses of the different schools' teachers to questions about their professionalism of attitudes and behaviors, derived in the manner explained in Appendix D. Each teacher was classified by the attributes of her school. For example, the top row of the table shows that of all teachers in schools which were in the top two quartiles in professional zeal, 61% described their jobs as better than most teaching positions. As Appendix D explains, the school attribute measure of subject vs. child orientation was calculated separately for elementary and secondary teachers,

TABLE III-4. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS WHO SAID THAT TEACHING WAS THE MOST SATISFYING CAREER THEY COULD REALISTICALLY IMAGINE, BY SELECTED PROFESSIONALLY RELEVANT VARIABLES

Variables and Responses or Scores	%	(N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	38	(5806)
Undecided (18: 3)	32	(1700)
Opposed (18: 4,5)	28	(1830)
Strongly favored education required of teachers (19: 5)	40	(4270)
Mildly favored (19: 4)	30	(2079)
Undecided or opposed (19: 1,2,3)	32	(2947)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	36	(3796)
Mildly favored or opposed (16: 2,3,4)	34	(5656)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	31	(4779)
High (25: 2,3)	39	(4181)
Did not oppose controversial activity (104: 1,2)	32	(6912)
Opposed (104: 3)	42	(2526)
Colleague reference group orientation (33: 3,4)	32	(2306)
Other or mixed orientation (33: 1,2,5,6,7)	36	(6230)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	30	(3617)
High (23: 3,4)	38	(5401)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	28	(1345)
Neutral (162: 4)	32	(2759)
Child-oriented (162: 5,6,7)	38	(5040)
Not bothered by failing a child (item B69: 1)	32	(1801)
Bothered somewhat (B69: 2)	33	(4849)
Bothered much (B69: 3,4)	40	(2720)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	41	(3225)
Low (15: 0,1,2)	32	(6131)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	42	(1707)
Did not consult colleagues often (item C61: 2,3,4)	34	(7813)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	37	(3826)
Spent fewer days than this at professional meetings (165)	33	(4742)

TABLE III-5. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS WHO SAID THAT THEIR CURRENT POSITIONS WERE BETTER THAN MOST TEACHING POSITIONS, BY SELECTED SCHOOL ATTRIBUTES

Variables and Responses or Scores	%	(N)
High professional zeal index (20S: 1,2)	61	(2543)
Low professional zeal index (20S: 3,4)	63	(2550)
High policy involvement (16S: 1,2)	63	(2749)
Low policy involvement (16S: 3,4)	60	(2435)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25S: 3,4)	63	(2585)
High bureaucratic submission index (25S: 1,2)	61	(2643)
High colleague reference group orientation (33S: 1,2)	62	(2641)
Low colleague reference group orientation (33S: 3,4)	61	(2580)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23S: 3,4)	65	(2786)
High holistic service emphasis index (23S: 1,2)	58	(2443)
Elementary schools: subject-oriented (162SE: 1,2)	65	(1230)
Elementary schools: child-oriented (162SE: 3,4)	64	(1304)
Secondary schools: subject-oriented (162SS: 1,2)	74	(776)
Secondary schools: child-oriented (162SS: 3,4)	67	(618)
High reading index (15S: 1,2)	59	(2588)
Low reading index (15S: 3,4)	64	(2648)
High attendance at professional meetings (165S: 1,2)	60	(2619)
Low attendance at professional meetings (165S: 3,4)	63	(2603)

since to lump the two kinds together would have put nearly all secondary schools at the top of the distribution of subject orientation.

Six of the nine comparisons shown in the table reveal no meaningful differences in the total sample in job satisfaction of teachers in schools high and low in professional attributes. Two of the three total-sample differences prove untrustworthy when race and level of the schools are controlled. There were too few Negro teachers in secondary schools high in subject orientation to check the finding about this variable among NM or NF teachers, and in the two categories of white secondary teachers, the positive relation of school subject orientation to individual job satisfaction was not reversed but shrank to less than 3%; a change by one WFS teacher would have reversed the direction of relationship in this category. Also untrustworthy is the total-sample finding that teachers in schools with low reading indexes were more satisfied than those in schools with high reading indexes. This finding appears to reflect the facts, reported in the next chapter, that Negroes tended to have higher reading indexes and lower job satisfaction than whites. There were too few Negroes in schools with low reading indexes to check out the effects of this variable among Negroes, and the total-sample difference was reversed in two of four categories of white teachers.

This leaves one finding, predicted by the hypothesis, that teachers in schools with low holistic service emphasis indexes were the most satisfied. N's were too small to allow checking of this finding among NME teachers, but the finding was borne out in five of the seven control categories where comparisons could be made, the exceptions being NMS and NFS teachers, among whom the relationship was opposite to that found in the total sample. Having found only one of the eight hypothesized relationships, we reject the hypothesis that school professionalism would lead to job satisfaction.

Table III-6 is analogous to Table III-4 but involves students rather than teachers. The percentages show how many students rated high in anticipated career satisfaction, and the independent variables listed at the left represent what we consider to be professional orientations and behaviors of the students. The hypothesis is that professionalism is related to anticipated career enthusiasm, especially among education majors, and most particularly among education career planners. The data do not support the hypothesis.

Amount of study made no difference in anticipated career enthusiasm in either group of education students. It did make a difference among non-education students, and the difference persisted in all four race-and-sex categories.

Desire to be thought of as a serious student was positively associated with anticipated career enthusiasm in both groups of education

TABLE III-6. PERCENTAGES OF STUDENT EDUCATION CAREER-PLANNERS, EDUCATION NON-CAREER PLANNERS, AND NON-EDUCATION MAJORS WHO SAID THAT NO OTHER OCCUPATION WOULD SUIT THEM AS WELL AS THE ONE THEY PLANNED TO ENTER, BY SELECTED VARIABLES

Variables and Responses	Education Career Planners		Education Non-Career Planners		Non-Education Majors	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Studied five hours a day or more (215C)	65	(179)	43	(351)	51	(623)
Studied less than this	66	(265)	42	(431)	44	(1030)
Wanted very much to be thought of as serious students (217C)	69	(228)	48	(336)	54	(744)
Did not want to be, or wanted only a little	62	(216)	39	(446)	41	(910)
Had grade averages of B- or better in previous semester (219C)	67	(194)	38	(325)	46	(626)
Had lower grade averages than this	64	(249)	46	(455)	47	(1023)
Were oriented to colleagues as occupational reference group (33C)	58	(19)	58	(24)	Not asked	
Had other or mixed orientations	63	(101)	48	(178)	Not asked	

majors, but the same relationship was even stronger among non-education majors. The only reversal of any of these relationships was one of 1% among WF education career planners; the relationship held up in eight control comparisons and could not be checked among NM students because there were too few of them.

Grade point average was unrelated to anticipated career enthusiasm among education career planners and non-education students. Among education non-career planners the relation was negative, not positive as hypothesized, and persisted in the WM and WF control categories but was reversed among NF students and could not be looked at among NM students because of small N's.

Colleague reference group orientation was not related in any systematic fashion to anticipated career enthusiasm of students. There were differences of 5% in the wrong direction among career planners and 10% in the right direction (from the standpoint of the hypothesis) among non-career planners, but these figures may mean nothing because the numbers of students with colleague reference group orientations were exceedingly small, fewer than 25 in both categories of students.

Thus, in general, it cannot be said that the most professionally inclined future teachers were the ones most enthusiastic about becoming teachers. They appear to have been so in the findings concerning only one of the four measures of professionalism, desire to be thought of as serious students, and this variable was associated with more difference in career enthusiasm among students of other subjects than among education majors.

Integration into Colleague Groups and Professionalism

If an occupation is a profession, we would expect the members of it who are most socially integrated into groups of colleagues to be the most professional in their attitudes and behavior, and we would expect professionalism to be most prevalent in the most highly cohesive work groups. The next five tables test these hypotheses. The hypotheses receive somewhat more support than the ones we have tested previously.

Table III-7 classifies teachers as highly integrated vs. less integrated into colleague groups on the basis of their answers to questionnaire item C60 (variable 61), which asked, "How often do other teachers ask you for advice about teaching methods or classroom problems?" Those who answered "often" were designated highly integrated, and those who gave other answers (sometimes, rarely, or never) were designated less integrated. The percentages compare professionalism of integrated and less integrated teachers.

The table shows that integration into a colleague group was positively related to three of the nine aspects of professionalism examined,

TABLE III-7. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINE VARIABLES, BY FREQUENCY WITH WHICH OTHER TEACHERS CONSULTED THEM

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Consulted Often (61: 1)		Not Consulted Often (61: 2,3,4)	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	67	(2484)	61	(6863)
Favored education required of teachers (19: 4,5)	70	(2464)	67	(6841)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	51	(2359)	54	(6612)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	28	(2265)	27	(6298)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	34	(2381)	42	(6648)
Not bothered by giving an F (item B69: 1)	18	(2493)	20	(6894)
High central life interest index (32: 2)	27	(2217)	23	(6227)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	47	(2493)	30	(6847)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	54	(2294)	41	(6255)

favoring self-improvement, the reading index, and attendance at professional meetings. Integration was, on the other hand, negatively related to professionalism as measured by the holistic service emphasis index; i.e., the socially integrated teachers were more likely than the others to be holistic in orientation. Of these differences, the three which showed integration related to professionalism held up in all eight race-sex-level categories of teachers, and the difference showing integration related to holistic orientation was reversed among WMS and NME teachers but persisted in the other six categories.

Integration into a colleague group as measured by self-reported frequency of being consulted made no difference--i.e., a difference of less than 5%--in the other five professionalism variables: favoring educational requirements for teachers, bureaucratic submission index, colleague reference group orientation, holism as indicated by not being bothered by the need to give an F, and the index of work as a central life interest.[6]

These findings are far from an overwhelming indication of support for the hypothesis of professionalism among teachers, with three of nine relationships in the predicted direction but one in the direction opposite to the one predicted, but they give more indication that the teachers we studied were professionals than our earlier tables do. The differences favoring integrated teachers in the two variables which reflect actual behavior rather than just thoughts or words, the reading index and attending professional meetings, were quite marked.

Table III-8 compares the same nine professionally relevant variables among socially integrated and less integrated teachers, with integration measured by off-the-job occupational community rather than by on-the-job consultation. Teachers were defined as high in occupational community (variable 106, from questionnaire item D49) if they said that when they got together socially with people other than members of their own households, their companions were more often teachers than non-teachers. They were designated low in occupational community if they got together socially more often with non-teachers than with teachers.[7]

---

[6] The term "central life interest" is taken from Robert Dubin, "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," Social Problems, 4 (1956), pp. 131-142. See also Louis H. Orzack, "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals," Social Problems, 7 (1959), pp. 125-132. Orzack found that work was a central life interest of professionals. Dubin found that work was not a central life interest of industrial workers.

[7] The concept of occupational community is from Seymour Martin Lipset, Martin Trow, and James Coleman, Union Democracy, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1962. See especially pp. 77-159, 257-260, 413-418. The book was originally published in 1956 by The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois.

TABLE III-8. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINE VARIABLES, BY OCCUPATIONAL COMMUNITY

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	High Occupational Community (106: 1,2) %	High Occupational Community (106: 1,2) (N)	Low Occupational Community (106: 3,4) %	Low Occupational Community (106: 3,4) (N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	65	(3580)	60	(5675)
Favored education required of teachers (19: 4,5)	71	(3554)	67	(5662)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	53	(3417)	53	(5480)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	26	(3295)	28	(5190)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	37	(3436)	41	(5510)
Not bothered by giving an F (item B69: 1)	20	(3593)	19	(5699)
High central life interest index (32: 2)	29	(3247)	21	(5143)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	38	(3582)	32	(5672)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	50	(3277)	41	(5207)

On four of the nine variables there were relationships in the hypothesized direction, with integrated teachers more professional, in the total sample; but three of these differences evaporate when race, sex, and level are controlled and the fourth does not receive overwhelming confirmation when separate race-sex-level categories are examined. Integrated and less integrated teachers differed as predicted by 5% in the total sample in favoring professional self-improvement. We neglected to run tables relating this variable to occupational community with race, sex, and level controlled, but we did control these teacher characteristics in tables which related occupational community to the professional zeal index, one of whose components is favoring self-improvement, and found four positive relationships and four negative relationships in the eight comparisons--no support for the hypothesis that social integration fosters this aspect of professionalism. High occupational community was associated with high reading index scores in the total sample, but this relationship also was reversed in four of eight comparisons within race-sex-level categories. Essentially the same is true of the relation of occupational community to frequent attendance at professional meetings. The data for the total sample show teachers high in occupational community attending more meetings than those low in occupational community, but this relationship persisted in only five of eight race-sex-level control categories, and in some of the five comparisons where it was upheld, the differences were minuscule, sometimes less than 1%. Thus we cannot conclude that high occupational community led to frequent attendance at meetings.

One relationship shown for the total sample in Table III-8 was upheld in six of the eight control comparisons, with the differences generally rather sizable, so we can perhaps accept it as valid. Teachers with high occupational community were more likely by 8% to make the maximum score on the central life interest index, and occupational community was positively related to this index score in all subcategories of teachers except WME and NFS.

From all of this it cannot be said with any assurance that integration into colleague groups off the job--i.e., occupational community--had a professionalizing effect. Such an effect was apparent with respect to only one of the nine variables looked at, and the conclusion in this instance rests upon slightly insecure ground since the relationship was reversed in two of eight control comparisons.

The next two tables are somewhat similar in logic to the previous two, but with schools rather than individual teachers as the units of analysis. They classify schools by the extent to which their teachers consulted each other (Table III-9) and formed occupational communities (Table III-10), and examine the percentages of schools in the resulting categories which rated high in selected aspects of school professionalism. Appendixes C and D discuss the procedures used in classifying and analyzing schools as units.

When relationships between school attributes are found in the total sample, it is not possible to examine them with race controlled, for

8

only 56 of the 472 schools which qualified for school-as-unit analysis were Negro schools. This is a smaller percentage of Negro schools than of Negro teachers in the sample, mainly because rates of questionnaire return were lower among Negroes than among whites and were a criterion for including schools in this type of analysis. It is possible, however, to compare elementary and secondary white schools. By using variable 149S, the percentage of respondents from each school who were male, it would have been possible to control school faculty sex composition, but we have not done so because nearly all the schools with high percentages of male teachers were secondary schools, so that the control of grade level amounts to virtually the same thing as the control of sex composition would.

Table III-9, which classifies schools by frequency of colleague consultation, indicates that a number of fairly clear-cut differences in school professionalism were associated with differences in the social integration of teachers. Not all the differences, however, were in the hypothesized direction; in some respects the more cohesive schools were the less professional ones. The more cohesive schools were the more professional with respect to the professional zeal index, policy involvement, future career commitment, future career commitment of women teachers, and the reading index. They appeared to be slightly so with respect to attendance at professional meetings, but this difference was reversed in WE schools. On the other hand, the more often a school's teachers consulted each other, the less professional the school was likely to be according to measures of two aspects of the absence of holistic service orientation, the holistic service emphasis index and subject orientation. The tendency for the most socially integrated schools to be the least subject-oriented was observed in both elementary and secondary schools. Data for the total sample show schools in the highest quartile of colleague consultation having the lowest bureaucratic submission index scores, a finding which would fit the hypothesis, but one which cannot be accepted because it was reversed in both WE and WS schools.

Table III-10 classifies schools by the amounts of occupational community of their teachers, and examines the same dependent school attribute variables as were examined in the preceding table, plus consultation by other teachers, which was the independent variable in the preceding table. This time the results are less clear-cut. The only regular progressions seen in the total sample, with schools in each quartile of occupational community being more professional (or less) than schools in the next lower quartile, were positive relationships of school occupational community to the professional zeal index and to consultation by other teachers; but the latter relationship was slightly reversed in WS schools and weak, the difference being only 4%, in WE schools.

There were several instances in which schools in the topmost quartile of occupational community stood out from the rest, but those

TABLE III-9. PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOLS IN MOST PROFESSIONAL TWO QUARTILES OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF PROFESSIONALISM, BY SCHOOL QUARTILE IN CONSULTATION OF TEACHERS BY EACH OTHER (VARIABLE 61S)

Aspects of School Professionalism	School Quartile in Teacher Consultation			
	1 % (N of Schools in Quartile)	2 % (N of Schools in Quartile)	3 % (N of Schools in Quartile)	4 % (N of Schools in Quartile)
Professional zeal index (20S: 1,2)	56 (114)	53 (129)	48 (112)	37 (113)
Policy involvement (16S: 1,2)	61 (114)	55 (131)	42 (112)	43 (114)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25S: 3,4)	40 (114)	54 (130)	55 (111)	51 (113)
Attitude toward controversial activity (104S: 3,4)	54 (113)	53 (131)	43 (112)	57 (115)
Colleague reference group (33S: 1,2)	50 (113)	43 (129)	47 (112)	47 (112)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23S; 3,4)	42 (113)	48 (129)	53 (112)	57 (114)
Subject orientation, elementary schools (162SE: 1,2)	43 (87)	42 (72)	63 (57)	58 (64)
Subject orientation, secondary schools (162SS: 1,2)	40 (15)	47 (30)	56 (25)	56 (16)
Future career commitment (126S: 1,2)	51 (108)	58 (122)	52 (109)	36 (98)
Future career commitment of women teachers (F126S: 1,2)	51 (108)	57 (121)	52 (107)	37 (95)
Reading index (15S: 1,2)	61 (114)	59 (131)	46 (112)	42 (113)
Days attending professional meetings (165S: 1,2)	55 (114)	53 (128)	51 (112)	47 (112)

TABLE III-10. PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOLS IN MOST PROFESSIONAL TWO QUARTILES OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF PROFESSIONALISM, BY SCHOOL QUARTILE IN OCCUPATIONAL COMMUNITY (VARIABLE 106S)

	School Quartile in Occupational Community			
Aspects of School Professionalism	1 % (N of Schools in Quartile)	2 % (N of Schools in Quartile)	3 % (N of Schools in Quartile)	4 % (N of Schools in Quartile)
Professional zeal index (20S: 1,2)	59 (117)	53 (129)	47 (97)	35 (125)
Policy involvement (16S: 1,2)	60 (118)	47 (131)	55 (97)	42 (125)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25S: 3,4)	49 (117)	43 (129)	58 (96)	53 (126)
Attitude toward controversial activity (104S: 3,4)	51 (118)	50 (131)	58 (97)	41 (125)
Colleague reference group (33S: 1,2)	34 (117)	55 (128)	49 (97)	48 (124)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23S: 3,4)	47 (117)	52 (130)	47 (97)	52 (124)
Subject orientation, elementary schools (162SE: 1,2)	61 (79)	47 (76)	44 (50)	45 (75)
Subject orientation, secondary schools (162SS: 1,2)	23 (13)	50 (28)	59 (27)	56 (18)
Future career commitment (126S: 1,2)	60 (114)	47 (124)	49 (92)	44 (107)
Future career commitment of women teachers (F126S: 1,2)	59 (111)	48 (122)	50 (92)	43 (106)
Reading index (15S: 1,2)	68 (118)	49 (130)	43 (97)	48 (125)
Consultation by other teachers (61S: 1,2)	58 (118)	52 (131)	51 (97)	47 (126)
Days attending professional meetings (165S: 1,2)	68 (116)	47 (129)	47 (96)	46 (125)

in the other three quartiles were alike or showed zigzag patterns of professionalism. (By a zigzag pattern we mean one with professionalism going up from quartile 2 to quartile 3, then down from quartile 3 to 4, or down and then up.) Schools in the top occupational community quartile were the most professional in policy involvement, subject orientation of elementary schools, future career commitment, future career commiment of women teachers, the reading index, and attendance at professional meetings. Schools with the most occupational community were the least professional in colleague reference group orientation and subject orientation of secondary schools. However, these evidences of distinctiveness of schools which ranked very high in occupational community would vanish or be greatly diminished if the Negro schools were removed from the sample. They result mainly from the fact that 100% of the Negro schools were in the top two quartiles of occupational community, and nearly all were in the very top quartile, with the result that quartile 1 had some of the distinctively Negro characteristics which will be discussed in the next chapter. The high occupational community of the Negroes is probably caused by Negro teachers' being a relatively elite group in their communities; there were not many middle-class people they could associate with except each other.

The small or nonexistent relationship of occupational community to consultation by colleagues is noteworthy. These variables were rather weakly related in the total sample of schools but the relationship almost disappeared in WE schools and was slightly reversed (by 2%) in WS schools, as was mentioned above. Apparently social relationships off the job were not translated into consulting relationships on the job. Perhaps this finding, or non-finding, should be considered an indication of nonprofessionalism among teachers.

Table III-11 tests the proposition that "educational community," a student analogue of occupational community measured by the amount of their social time the students spent with friends majoring in the same subjects as they themselves were majoring in, has professionalizing effects. The hypothesis fares well in the data on occupational reference groups, but not in the data on wanting to be considered a serious student or women's career plans.

Integration into student colleague groups was related as predicted to naming colleagues as the future occupational reference group, among both the career-planning and non-career planning education students. (No comparable question was asked of non-education majors.) The procedure used to get the reference group index lost so many cases that only among the WF non-career planners were the N's larger than 25 among respondents both high and low in educational community, but in this instance we looked at the race-sex control groups anyway, and found that the relation of educational community to choice of colleagues as the reference group existed in three of four race-sex categories of career planners, and also in three of four categories of non-career

TABLE III-11. PERCENTAGES OF STUDENT EDUCATION CAREER-PLANNERS, EDUCATION NON-CAREER PLANNERS, AND NON-EDUCATION MAJORS PROFESSIONALLY ORIENTED ACCORDING TO THREE VARIABLES, BY AMOUNT OF SOCIAL TIME SPENT WITH MAJORS IN SAME SUBJECT

Professional Orientations, among Students High and Low in Social Time Spent with Majors in Same Subject	Education Career Planners		Education Non-Career Planners		Non-Education Majors	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Wanted very much to be thought of as serious students (217C) among those who:						
Spent 25% or more of time with fellow majors (222C)	49	(227)	42	(380)	46	(746)
Spent less time than this with fellow majors	53	(214)	43	(392)	42	(988)
Were oriented to colleagues as occupational reference group (33C) among those who:						
Spent 25% or more of time with fellow majors (222C)	20	(61)	17	(81)	Not asked	
Spent less time than this with fellow majors	11	(56)	8	(113)	Not asked	
Wanted to work continuously after having children (229C) among women who:						
Spent 25% or more of time with fellow majors (222C)	54	(129)	13	(310)	25	(269)
Spent less time than this with fellow majors	58	(123)	12	(319)	19	(332)

planners, including the WF students. The differences in the total sample, roughly two-to-one among both career planners and non-career planners, were big enough that we can probably accept this relationship as meaningful even though the control procedure is hampered by small N's. This difference is in the direction that was hypothesized, suggesting professionalism.

The hypothesis is not supported in looking at the effects of educational community on the two other variables. Educational community was not related to the desire to be considered a serious student in either group of education majors or among the non-education students. Educational community was unrelated to the desire of women education students to work continuously after marriage, but the two variables were related among non-education women students, a finding which makes the non-education students appear more professional than those studying education. When this relationship is examined among Negro and white non-education students separately, it disappears among the white women, 14% of whom in both the high and low educational community categories wanted to have continuous work careers; but among the NF non-education students, 58% of those high in educational community as contrasted with 40% of those low in educational community hoped to have continuous work careers.

The immense race difference in this last variable is noteworthy although it does not bear directly on the hypothesis now under consideration. Nearly half, 49%, of the Negro women students but only 15% of the whites expressed a desire to work continuously after marriage. These figures differed hardly at all among education vs. non-education students. The race difference does not, as one might guess, appear to reflect greater expectation by the Negro students that they would have to keep working whether they wanted to or not. The question was plainly intended to get at desire, not resignation to an unavoidable fate. It was worded as follows: "Assume that you will marry, and that your husband will make enough money so that you will not have to work after marriage unless you want to. Under these circumstances, would you prefer ...:" The percentages we have referred to indicate how many women said that they would prefer "to continue working, even after you have children ... ." The prospect of being full-time housewives did not appeal as much to Negro as to white women students. The moral for employers who want to keep employee turnover down might be to avoid hiring young white women and look for Negro women instead, if such behavior were not forbidden by the civil rights law.

The fact that some students whom we have labeled "non-career planners" show up in the table as wanting to work continuously after marriage needs to be explained. The two variables were measured with different questionnaire items, A67 and A62 respectively. A student might want to work continuously but not in the field of education, or she might be uncertain about the matter and change her mind in mid-questionnaire. In either of these ways she could appear in our tabulations in the anomalous category of a non-career planner who wanted to work continuously after marriage.

Interrelations of Professional Characteristics

In an occupation which encourages and supports professionalism, we should expect to find that professional orientations are associated with each other and with professional behavior, so as to form an identifiable cluster of mutually reinforcing beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. Members of the occupation who are most professional in one respect should also be the most professional in other respects.

The next six tables explore the extent to which these things were true in our sample of teachers. Tables III-12 through III-16 classify teachers by attitude toward professional self-improvement, the bureaucratic submission index, the occupational reference group index, the holistic service emphasis index, and future career commitment, and show the percentages of teachers in the resulting categories who were professional by various criteria. Table III-17 summarizes these results and some related findings from Table III-7, which gave data on professionalism of teachers who consulted and did not consult colleagues often. The reader who has an avid thirst for data may inspect Tables III-12 through Table III-16 to satisfy himself of the validity of our interpretations, but in the following discussion we turn immediately to the summary of findings in Table III-17.

Table III-17 shows, with plusses and minusses, which aspects of professionalism were related to each other and whether positively or negatively. The numbers under the plus and minus signs show the number of times each relationship was upheld in the eight separate comparisons (not shown in the tables) within race-sex-level categories of teachers. A zero means either that two variables were unrelated in the total sample, or that a relationship observed in the total sample was reversed three or more times in the eight control comparisons; which of these is meant by a given zero can be seen in the earlier tables. An "X" means that the relationship, or nonrelationship, of two variables is shown elsewhere in the table. For example, reading across from colleague reference group orientation, there is an X under bureaucratic submission. This means that the relation of these two variables is to be found by reading across from bureaucratic submission index and down from colleague reference group orientation.

One weakness in this form of summarizing the findings should be acknowledged. Since our criterion for considering a relationship meaningful is a 5% difference in the dependent variable between categories of the independent variable, rather than a test of significance of the difference--for reasons explained in Chapter II--it is possible that some of the differences we found would have appeared as non-differences

TABLE III-12. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO EIGHT VARIABLES, BY ATTITUDE TOWARD PROFESSIONAL SELF-IMPROVEMENT

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Favored Self-Improvement (18: 1,2) %	Favored Self-Improvement (18: 1,2) (N)	Did Not Favor It (18: 3,4,5) %	Did Not Favor It (18: 3,4,5) (N)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	42	(5788)	38	(3531)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	48	(5516)	62	(3413)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	25	(5244)	30	(3192)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	14	(5614)	15	(3420)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	52	(4814)	40	(2926)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	42	(5729)	22	(3468)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	19	(5832)	17	(3549)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	49	(5264)	38	(3173)

TABLE III-13. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO SEVEN VARIABLES, BY BUREAUCRATIC SUBMISSION INDEX

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Low Bureaucratic Submission Index (25: 0,1)		High Bureaucratic Submission Index (25: 2,3)	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	29	(4320)	26	(3823)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	46	(4643)	34	(4042)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	15	(4655)	15	(4035)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	46	(3948)	49	(3499)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	31	(4709)	37	(4134)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	18	(4803)	18	(4197)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	42	(4313)	47	(3831)

TABLE III-14. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO SIX VARIABLES, BY OCCUPATIONAL REFERENCE GROUP INDEX

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Colleague Reference Group Orientation (33: 3,4)		Other or Mixed Orientation (33: 1,2,5,6,7)	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	43	(2238)	39	(5940)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	15	(2246)	15	(6007)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	44	(1967)	48	(5105)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	32	(2280)	34	(6137)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	21	(2322)	17	(6276)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	41	(2126)	46	(5634)

TABLE III-15. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO FIVE VARIABLES, BY HOLISTIC SERVICE EMPHASIS INDEX

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Low Holistic Service Emphasis Index (23: 0,1,2)		High Holistic Service Emphasis Index (23: 3,4)	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	36	(3609)	44	(5401)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	44	(3040)	50	(4460)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	31	(3579)	37	(5325)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	16	(3637)	20	(5425)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	41	(3294)	47	(4910)

TABLE III-16. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO THREE VARIABLES, BY FUTURE CAREER COMMITMENT

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Wanted Lifelong Teaching Careers (126: 1)		Did Not Want Lifelong Teaching Careers (126: 2,3,4,5)	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	41	(3516)	29	(4032)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	18	(3730)	18	(4126)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	46	(3249)	43	(3717)

TABLE III-17. SUMMARY OF RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PROFESSIONAL VARIABLES

Independent Variables and Designated Responses or Scores	High Policy Involvement (16:1)	Low Bureaucratic Submission Index (25: 0,1)	Colleague Reference Group (33: 3,4)	Low Holistic Service Emphasis Index (23: 0,1,2)	Subject-Oriented (162: 1,2,3)	Lifelong Classroom Teaching Commitment (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	High Reading Index (15: 3,4)	Consulted Colleagues Often (Item C61: 1)	Attended Many Professional Meetings (165: 5 or more
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	0	- 8/8	0		0	+ 6/8	+ 8/8	0	+ 7/8
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)			0	+ 8/8	0	0	- 7/8	0	- 6/8
Colleague reference group orientation (33: 3,4)		X		0	0	0	0	0	0
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	- 8/8	X	X			- 6/8	- 6/8	0	0
Lifelong classroom teaching commitment (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	X	X	X	X			+ 7/8	0	0
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	X	X	X	X		X	+ 8/8		+ 8/8

Source: Tables III-7, III-12 through III-16.

Key: + means positive relation between two aspects of professionalism, - means negative relation between two aspects of professionalism, 0 means no relation, X means relationship shown elsewhere in table, blank means no tabulation done. Fractions indicate number of comparisons within race-sex-level categories in which relationship was in prevailing direction.

(or vice versa) if the independent and dependent variables had been reversed; and to call one variable in this set independent and the other dependent is arbitrary, since neither our theory nor any known temporal sequence tells us which variable might have caused the other, if indeed either did, when two of them were related.

These data give scant support, if any, for the hypothesis that teachers who were professional in some ways would also be professional in other ways. The tabulations reveal seven positive relationships between professional characteristics, six negative relationships, and eighteen instances where professional characteristics were not related to each other.

Rather than showing that teachers tended either to be professional or unprofessional in a general way, the findings suggest that if a more elaborate analysis technique were used, such as factor analysis, two general clusters of orientations and behaviors would emerge. Within each cluster, the variables were positively associated with each other, but the two clusters were negatively associated, so that teachers who were the most professional according to the variables in one cluster tended to be the least professional according to the variables in the other cluster. In one cluster were variables concerned with knowledge orientation (#18), future career commitment (#126), and the three professional behaviors, reading (#15), consulting (item C61), and attending professional meetings (#165). In the other were variables concerned with orientation to autonomy and colleague group power (being low in #25) and absence of holistic service orientation (being low in #23). In no instance was a variable in one of these clusters positively related to a variable in the other cluster, and in only one instance, involving the holistic service emphasis index and policy involvement, were variables we have assigned to the same cluster negatively related. Reference group orientation was not related to any variable and therefore cannot be assigned to either cluster.

To put the matter more simply, some teachers tended to rank high in knowledge orientation, career commitment, and professional behavior; others ranked low in docility and holism; still others were oriented to colleagues as their main reference group; but these were three different groups of teachers. In a profession as we have defined it, they ought to be the same people, and those not fitting the pattern ought to regard themselves as deviants and be unhappy. Our findings on professionalism and career satisfaction, given in Table III-4 and discussed earlier in this chapter, indicated high career satisfaction among teachers who were high in two aspects of the first cluster of variables, knowledge orientation and professional behavior; but low career satisfaction among teachers who were low in holism and high in orientation to autonomy and colleague group power, these being dimensions of our second cluster. Career satisfaction was unrelated to career commitment or reference group orientation. The teachers most contented with their careers were, in short, likely to be eager beavers who worked hard and believed in improving themselves professionally, who were submissive to authority, and who were oriented to holistic service.

In Chapter IV we shall show that some of these orientations and behaviors were related to the teachers' race, sex, and grade level taught. But this fact does not explain the relations shown in Table III-17, for only those relationships are indicated there which were upheld with race, sex, and level controlled.

School Professionalism and Individual Professionalism

Tables III-18 through III-22 classify teachers by several aspects of the professionalism of their schools, and test the hypothesis that teachers in the schools with the most professional atmospheres would be the most professional individuals. The reasoning behind the hypothesis is that a professional atmosphere will have professionalizing effects on the individuals exposed to it.

The attributes of school professionalism dealt with in the five tables are the professional zeal index, the bureaucratic submission index, colleague reference group orientation, the holistic service emphasis index, and the future career commitment of women teachers. This last seemed to be a better measure to employ than the future career commitment of all teachers would have been, because most male teachers expected to stay in the field of education, whether as teachers or administrators, whereas schools varied widely in the percentages of their women teachers who wanted to stay in the occupation. The individual counterparts of the various school attributes are not used in the tables which use these attributes as independent variables, since the two are related by definition; an individual's answer to a question or score on an index is a component of his school's classification by the variable.

If the hypothesis that school professionalism was related to individual professionalism had been supported, we could have tested further the reasoning behind the hypothesis, that the relationship was due to exposure to a climate of professionalism, by seeing whether the relationship was strongest among those teachers who had been in the schools the longest. A negative finding in such a test would suggest that the relationship of school to individual professionalism was due to selectivity of highly professional teachers into the schools which were already highly professional. But as we shall shortly see, there was little or no such relationship to explain, so we did not have occasion to test the exposure vs. selectivity explanations.

Since we have already discovered in the previous section that the various characteristics of teacher professionalism did not all hang together when individuals were looked at, it should not come as a shock to learn from Tables III-18 through III-22 that there was hardly any relationship between professionalism of schools in some respects and professionalism of their teachers in other respects. The criterion we used to establish

TABLE III-18. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINE VARIABLES, BY SCHOOL QUARTILE IN PROFESSIONAL ZEAL INDEX (VARIABLE 20S)

	School Quartile in Professional Zeal Index			
Aspects of Teacher Professionalism	1 % (N)	2 % (N)	3 % (N)	4 % (N)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	42 (1197)	40 (1429)	36 (1567)	37 (1064)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	49 (1122)	53 (1355)	53 (1498)	58 (1004)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	25 (1085)	26 (1297)	29 (1407)	26 (947)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	35 (1142)	40 (1363)	41 (1518)	43 (1011)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	13 (1144)	17 (1383)	14 (1516)	14 (1016)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	52 (985)	50 (1156)	47 (1277)	43 (853)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	41 (1178)	35 (1412)	31 (1543)	27 (1041)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	20 (1206)	19 (1435)	17 (1577)	16 (1069)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	51 (1063)	41 (1304)	39 (1436)	34 (955)

TABLE III-19. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO SIX VARIABLES, BY SCHOOL QUARTILE IN BUREAUCRATIC SUBMISSION INDEX (VARIABLE 25S)

	School Quartile in Bureaucratic Submission Index			
Aspects of Teacher Professionalism	4 % (N)	3 % (N)	2 % (N)	1 % (N)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	27 (984)	29 (1418)	24 (1298)	27 (1034)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	43 (1058)	42 (1496)	38 (1381)	37 (1094)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	47 (890)	47 (1285)	48 (1172)	50 (920)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	69 (1090)	67 (1530)	64 (1422)	65 (1130)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	18 (1118)	18 (1560)	18 (1452)	17 (1155)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	38 (990)	39 (1407)	44 (1310)	43 (1048)

TABLE III-20. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO SIX VARIABLES, BY SCHOOL QUARTILE IN COLLEAGUE REFERENCE GROUP ORIENTATION (VARIABLE 33S)

Aspects of Teacher Professionalism	School Quartile in Colleague Reference Group Orientation			
	1 % (N)	2 % (N)	3 % (N)	4 % (N)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	40 (1190)	40 (1358)	41 (1510)	37 (968)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	12 (1202)	14 (1356)	16 (1520)	14 (973)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	47 (1007)	46 (1133)	49 (1323)	51 (802)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	32 (1230)	33 (1383)	33 (1550)	39 (1003)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	19 (1252)	18 (1415)	17 (1595)	17 (1017)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	37 (1124)	39 (1301)	44 (1409)	46 (916)

TABLE III-21. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO FIVE VARIABLES, BY SCHOOL QUARTILE IN HOLISTIC SERVICE EMPHASIS INDEX (VARIABLE 23S)

Aspects of Teacher Professionalism	School Quartile in Holistic Service Emphasis Index			
	4 % (N)	3 % (N)	2 % (N)	1 % (N)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	35 (1302)	37 (1503)	39 (1384)	42 (1068)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	46 (1073)	47 (1231)	51 (1122)	47 (846)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	30 (1281)	33 (1482)	35 (1354)	37 (1056)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	17 (1306)	18 (1518)	17 (1382)	20 (1081)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	38 (1189)	40 (1364)	42 (1245)	47 (959)

TABLE III-22. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO THREE VARIABLES, BY SCHOOL QUARTILE IN FUTURE CAREER COMMITMENT OF WOMEN TEACHERS (VARIABLE F126S)

	School Quartile in Future Career Commitment of Women Teachers			
Aspects of Teacher Professionalism	1 % (N)	2 % (N)	3 % (N)	4 % (N)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	37 (1011)	37 (1317)	31 (1393)	30 (1281)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	18 (1036)	19 (1354)	17 (1418)	18 (1305)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	45 (909)	46 (1211)	37 (1283)	39 (1198)

relationships in inspecting these tables was that teachers in quartiles 1 and 2 combined of the school context variables should differ in the dependent variables by 5% or more from teachers in schools in quartiles 3 and 4 combined.

Failing to meet this criterion were the relations of school professional zeal index to individual bureaucratic submission index, reference group orientation, holistic service emphasis index, subject orientation, and consultation of other teachers (Table III-18), of school bureaucratic submission index to individual reference group orientation, holistic service emphasis index, future career commitment, reading index, and consultation of other teachers (Table III-19), of school colleague reference group orientation to individual holistic service emphasis index, subject orientation, future career commitment, reading index, and consultation of other teachers (Table III-20), of school holistic service emphasis index to individual attitude toward policy involvement, future career commitment and consultation of other teachers (Table III-21), and of school future career commitment of women teachers to individual consultation of other teachers (Table III-22). Meeting the criterion of difference in the total sample but failing to hold up consistently within race-sex-level control categories were the relations of school professional zeal index to individual future career commitment and attendance at professional meetings (Table III-18), of school bureaucratic submission index to individual attendance at professional meetings (Table III-19), of school colleague reference group orientation to individual attendance at professional meetings (Table III-20), and of school holistic service emphasis index to individual attendance at professional meetings (Table III-21). All told, this list indicates 24 negative results and does not make our hypothesis look good.

There were, however, five relationships which were found in the total sample and persisted consistently (none being reversed more than twice) with race, sex, and level controlled. Four of these were in the direction hypothesized and one was in the opposite direction. Table III-18 shows that teachers in schools with high professional zeal indexes were more likely than other teachers to favor policy involvement and to read a lot. Table III-21 indicates that teachers in schools with low holistic service emphasis indexes were less likely than other teachers to attend a lot of professional meetings. Table III-22 shows that teachers in schools which rated high in future career commitment of women teachers were more likely than other teachers to read a lot and to attend many professional meetings.

We thus have five relationships shown in 29 efforts to find relationships, and four of the five are in the predicted direction. All five of the relationships are consistent with those concerning individual teacher variables which were reported in the previous section, a fact which is of some interest although the two sets of findings are not completely independent of each other, inasmuch as the individual teacher responses dealt with in the preceding section went into the school measures dealt with in the present section.

School Professionalism, Individual Integration into Colleague Groups, and Individual Professionalism

In earlier sections we have reported that integration of a teacher into a colleague group did not necessarily make her professional, and that being in schools whose atmospheres were professional had few if any professionalizing effects on individual teachers. But what about the combined effects of these variables? Were teachers unusually likely to be professional if they not only taught in highly professional schools, but also were strongly integrated into colleague groups within these schools? If exposure to a climate of professionalism has an effect, integration into a group of colleagues should increase the likelihood that an individual will have an attitude or engage in a behavior if a high percentage of her colleagues in the school where she teaches does so.

Table III-23 tests the hypothesis that such an effect occurred among our teachers with respect to five orientations and behaviors. Integration into the colleague group is measured by whether the teacher said that she was asked for advice often by her colleagues. The hypothesis predicts that those who were consulted often would be influenced to have the characteristic more in schools where high percentages of the teachers had the characteristic than in schools where lower percentages of the teachers had the characteristic. Since our measure of integration was itself related to some of the characteristics in question, apart from schools' possession of them, to test the hypothesis it was necessary to compare the extent of difference in each dependent variable between integrated and unintegrated teachers in schools which were high in possession of the characteristic with the extent of the difference made by colleague group integration in schools low in possession of the characteristic. In other words, the test of the hypothesis is whether colleague group integration made a bigger difference in the dependent variables in highly professional than in less professional schools.

Examining the differences between differences as explained above, and following our usual procedure of regarding a difference of 5% or more as meaningful but one of 4% or less as meaningless, we get mixed results which add up to a rejection of the hypothesis.

The hypothesis is supported only with respect to colleague reference group orientation. Integrated teachers were 4% more likely than unintegrated teachers (42% minus 38%) to name colleagues as their reference group in schools high in colleague reference group orientation than in schools low in this respect, but in schools low in colleague reference group orientation, the integrated teachers were 1% less likely to name colleagues as their reference group than the unintegrated teachers were. Subtracting -1% from 4%, we obtain a difference of +5% in the direction predicted by the hypothesis.

TABLE III-23. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO FIVE VARIABLES, BY FREQUENCY WITH WHICH OTHER TEACHERS CONSULTED THEM, IN SCHOOLS WHICH WERE IN MOST PROFESSIONAL TWO QUARTILES AND LEAST PROFESSIONAL TWO QUARTILES OF SCHOOL ATTRIBUTE COUNTERPARTS OF THE DEPENDENT INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES

School Attribute Quartiles and Individual Dependent Variables	Consulted Often (61: 1)		Not Consulted Often (61: 2,3,4)	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
Bureaucratic submission index				
Individuals low (25: 0,1) in schools which were low (25S: 3,4)	64	(612)	65	(1901)
Individuals low (25: 0,1) in schools which were high (25S: 1,2)	40	(625)	41	(1814)
Colleague reference group orientation				
Individuals high (33: 3,4) in schools which were high (33S: 1,2)	42	(590)	38	(1789)
Individuals high (33: 3,4) in schools which were low (33S: 3,4)	14	(600)	15	(1735)
Holistic service emphasis index				
Individuals low (23: 0,1,2) in schools which were low (23S: 3,4)	39	(640)	50	(2042)
Individuals low (23: 0,1,2) in schools which were high (23S: 1,2)	28	(618)	33	(1708)
Reading Index				
Individuals high (15: 3,4) in schools which were high (15S: 1,2)	59	(714)	43	(1837)
Individuals high (15: 3,4) in schools which were low (15S: 3,4)	31	(591)	18	(2007)
Days attending professional meetings				
Individuals high (165: 5 or more) in schools which were high (165S: 1,2)	66	(614)	55	(1750)
Individuals high (165: 5 or more) in schools which were low (165S: 3,4)	33	(574)	22	(1792)

The hypothesis fails to receive support with respect to the bureaucratic submission index, the reading index, or attendance at professional meetings. Being consulted often decreased by 1% the probability that a teacher would have a low bureaucratic submission score, whether her school rated low or high in bureaucratic submission. It increased by 11% the probability that she would attend many meetings, whether her school rated high or low in this characteristic. It increased the probability that she would score high on the reading index by 16% if her school was high in this respect, and by 13% if it was low; in this instance the effect of colleague group integration was, as predicted, greater in the more professional schools, but by only 3%, not enough to meet our criterion of a meaningful difference.

The hypothesis is resoundingly rejected by the data on the holistic service emphasis index. Whether the school was low (professional) or high in holistic service emphasis, the teachers who were consulted often were less likely than those not consulted often to have low holistic index scores. The difference in holism made by being consulted often was -11% in the less holistic schools and -5% in the more holistic schools. Subtracting, we obtain a difference of -6%. If the reader has been able to follow our somewhat arcane reasoning this far, he will perceive that these findings argue against the hypothesis in not one but two ways. First, according to the hypothesis, integrated teachers should have been not less but more likely to have low holistic service emphasis index scores in the schools which were low in holistic service emphasis. Second, the difference made by colleague group integration in the probability that a teacher would give the more professional responses should have been greater in the highly professional schools than in the less professional ones, and to be sure, it was, but the difference should have been in a positive direction and the one we found was negative.

. . .

In this chapter we have examined a number of variables designed to measure the professionalism of teachers. The variables were taken from the definition of professionalism given in Chapter I. The first table in this chapter showed the prevalence of 19 professional characteristics among teachers. Comparative data on other occupations could be found concerning only two of these characteristics, colleague reference group orientation and career satisfaction. In both of these respects the teachers we studied compared poorly with members of fully professional occupations which have been studied by other researchers. We then tested six kinds of hypotheses, all of which one would expect to be true if the members of an occupation are professionals. None of the hypotheses drew much support from the data, and some were flatly rejected. The answer to the question, are teachers professionals, appears to be that in many crucial respects most of them are not.

CHAPTER IV

WHO ARE THE PROFESSIONALS?

Chapter III has shown that the teachers we studied were not particularly professional in some respects, by our definition of the term, and that some experiential and situational forces which would seem likely to have professionalizing effects on individuals in a thoroughly professional occupation tended not to have done so among these teachers. There were, however, a number of teachers whose attitudes and behavior were quite professional. The present chapter will report findings on who they were. The first section of the chapter will examine the relation of teachers' race, sex, and grade level taught to a number of professional variables. Subsequent sections will compare professionalism of teachers who differed in age, social status background, and community origin. The final section will give data on personal characteristics of the small number of teachers who were identified as "highly professional" by our eight-item measure (variable 76) which was designed to identify highly professional teachers. This entire chapter is purely descriptive, but the findings have implications for the recruitment of teachers which will be discussed in Chapter VII.

Race, Sex, and Grade Level Taught

Here we shall examine distributions of professionally relevant variables among the eight categories of teachers based on the threefold classification of them by race, sex, and grade level taught. Elementary teachers are those who taught grades 1 through 6; secondary, grades 7 through 12. As elsewhere in the report, the categories of teachers will be designated by initials: WME (white male elementary), WMS (white male secondary), NME (Negro male elementary), NMS (Negro male secondary, WFE (white female elementary), WFS (white female secondary), NFE (Negro female elementary), and NFS (Negro female secondary).

The attitudes and behaviors to be examined are of seven kinds: knowledge orientation, autonomy and college group power orientation, occupational reference group orientation, absence of holistic service orientation, intrinsic work commitment and career satisfaction, job satisfaction, and professional behavior. These are for the most part the same sorts of things as were looked at in Chapter III, with the addition of job satisfaction. Satisfaction with a particular job is not a part of the definition of professionalism, and indeed, the more professional a person is, the less we would expect him to like a job if it restricts autonomy or fails to give opportunities for the exercise of skills; but professional people, like people in other high-status occupations, tend in general to be highly satisfied with their jobs.[1] Dissatisfaction may be inherent in occupations like dishwashing or cotton picking, but if large numbers of people in an occupation such as teaching find their work disagreeable, something would seem to be wrong with the process of recruitment into the occupation or with the ways in which work situations are structured. Moreover, dishes can be washed clean by unhappy workers, but it is probable that children cannot be taught well by unhappy teachers.

In analyzing the over-all relations of race, sex, and grade level to attitudes and behaviors, we shall regard differences of 5% or more between races, sexes, or levels as meaningful. In addition, by inspecting distributions of variables among all eight categories of teachers, we can see whether their relationships to any of these three independent variables--race, sex, or level--persist with the other two held constant. Only the direction of relationship will be considered in determining whether relationships persist within control categories.

To anticipate the findings: race proves to be the main differentiating factor. Whites and Negroes differed with respect to most of the variables, their differences were often large, and most of their differences persisted in all four sex-and-level categories. In contrast, the sexes and levels differed by as much as 5% on fewer than half the variables; they rarely differed by as much as 10%; their differences persisted within control categories less often than the race differences did; and some apparent sex or level differences were revealed by the control procedure to be spurious, as when the sexes did not differ within elementary schools or within secondary schools although they differed within the total sample because elementary and secondary teachers differed and most men were secondary teachers. This does not mean that men and women, or elementary and secondary teachers, were identical. They differed in significant ways. But they were more alike than white and Negro teachers were.

Knowledge orientation. Table IV-1 compares knowledge orientations of whites and Negroes, of men and women, and of elementary and secondary teachers. It also shows the distribution of knowledge orientation among the eight categories of teachers derived from cross-classifying these

---

[1] For a summary of numerous studies of occupational differences in job satisfaction and an analysis of reasons for the differences, see Robert Blauner, "Occupational Differences in Work Satisfaction," in Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson (eds.), Social Organization and Behavior: A Reader in General Sociology, New York: Wiley, 1964, pp. 282-292, reprinted from Walter Galenson and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Labor and Trade Unionism: An Interdisciplinary Reader, New York: Wiley, 1960, pp. 341-352.

TABLE IV-1. TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE ORIENTATION VARIABLES BY RACE, SEX, AND LEVEL

Variables and Designated Responses	All Whites % (N)	All Negroes % (N)	All Men % (N)	All Women % (N)	All Elementary % (N)	All Secondary % (N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	59 (7327)	74 (1828)	63 (1748)	62 (7407)	62 (4936)	63 (4219)
Favored education required of teachers (19: 4,5)	66 (7311)	77 (1808)	68 (1743)	69 (7376)	67 (4904)	70 (4215)

	WME	WMS	NME	NMS	WFE	WFS	NFE	NFS
Favored professional self-improvement	58 (132)	61 (1207)	53 (106)	74 (303)	59 (3718)	59 (2270)	74 (980)	77 (439)
Favored education required of teachers	69 (132)	64 (1206)	76 (104)	80 (301)	65 (3703)	70 (2270)	74 (965)	81 (438)

three distinctions. The knowledge orientation variables examined are attitudes toward professional self-improvement and toward education required of teachers.

Negroes exceeded whites in knowledge orientation as measured by both variables. In eight racial comparisons within sex-and-level categories, this difference was reversed only once, with WME teachers exceeding NME in favoring professional self-improvement. More detailed figures not shown in the table indicate even greater racial differences than the table shows in the most extremely professional response category: 53% of the Negroes as contrasted with 30% of the whites agreed strongly that professional self-improvement was desirable; 59% of Negroes but only 43% of whites strongly agreed that extensive education should be required of teachers; and these differences remained large and consistent in all eight comparisons within sex-and-level categories. (The table shows the percentages agreeing with each statement, whether strongly or not.)

Men and women were alike--i.e., within 4% of each other--on both knowledge orientation variables in the total sample, and in six of eight control comparisons. The two exceptions within race-and-level categories are that women led men among NE teachers in favoring self-improvement and among WS teachers in favoring educational requirements.

Elementary and secondary teachers were similar in both aspects of knowledge orientation in the total sample, and in four of eight control comparisons. Secondary teachers were ahead in three control comparisons but elementary teachers led in one. We conclude that knowledge orientation is not systematically related to grade level tautht.

Autonomy and colleague group power orientation. The dependent variables under this general heading are attitude toward policy involvement, the bureaucratic submission index, and attitude toward controversial activity. Table IV-2 gives the findings.

The races differed systematically on only one of the three autonomy and colleague group power variables. Negroes believed more than whites in policy involvement, in the total sample and in all four sex-and-level categories.

Policy involvement was also the only one of the three variables to show a sex difference in the total sample, with men ahead in this measure of professionalism; but this sex difference was reversed among WE teachers and weak among WS teachers.

Secondary teachers believed more than elementary teachers in policy involvement, and this difference persisted within race-and sex categories,

TABLE IV-2. TEACHERS' AUTONOMY AND COLLEAGUE GROUP POWER VARIABLES BY RACE, SEX, AND LEVEL

Variables and Designated Responses	All Whites % (N)	All Negroes % (N)	All Men % (N)	All Women % (N)	All Elementary % (N)	All Secondary % (N)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	38 (7398)	51 (1860)	46 (1761)	39 (7497)	38 (5004)	44 (4254)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	54 (7061)	52 (1828)	53 (1723)	53 (7066)	54 (4692)	53 (4097)
Did not oppose controversial activity (104: 1,2)	74 (7404)	71 (1838)	77 (1768)	73 (7474)	70 (4999)	78 (4243)

	WME	WMS	NME	NMS	WFE	WFS	NFE	NFS
Strongly favored policy involvement	32 (135)	43 (1211)	56 (108)	60 (307)	35 (3764)	39 (2288)	47 (997)	54 (448)
Low bureaucratic submission index	57 (129)	54 (1194)	49 (105)	52 (295)	54 (3548)	53 (2190)	52 (910)	53 (418)
Did not oppose controversial activity	64 (137)	79 (1216)	72 (108)	76 (307)	70 (3772)	78 (2279)	69 (982)	74 (441)

indicating that men's concentration at the secondary level accounts for some of the sex difference previously observed. Teachers at the two levels did not differ in bureaucratic submission. Secondary teachers in the total sample and in all subcategories were more likely than elementary teachers to feel that teachers should not avoid controversial public activity.

Thus Negroes and secondary teachers led whites and elementary teachers in orientation to autonomy and colleague group power, but the differences were seldom large, and only in the comparison of levels were differences found in as many as two of the three variables. The teachers differed mainly in attitude toward policy involvement, and not at all in bureaucratic submission. The bureaucratic submission index appears not to be a very useful variable, in that it does not vary much.

Occupational reference group. Table IV-3 gives data on this variable.

Whites were more colleague-oriented than Negroes, hence more professional by this criterion. The difference was substantial in three sex-and-level categories but was only 1% (0.6%, to be precise) among ME teachers. The absence of a meaningful race difference in colleague orientation among ME teachers reflects an unusually low degree of orientation to superiors among the NME. Whites' greater colleague orientation was balanced mainly by more orientation to students and parents among the Negroes.

In the total sample, men were more oriented to colleagues than women were, women were more oriented to superiors than men were, and the sexes did not differ in orientation to students and parents. The lack of an over-all sex difference in student-parent orientation masks the fact that men exceeded women in this orientation among elementary teachers, both white and Negro, whereas women led in this orientation among secondary teachers. The only reversal of the male lead in colleague orientation was among WE teachers. The female lead in orientation to superiors was not reversed in any race-and-level category, though it was below 5% among WE and NS teachers.

Elementary and secondary teachers did not differ in the total sample in any of the three reference group orientations. They differed within some race-and-sex categories, but the differences were not all in the same direction. Most of these differences within subcategories were the results of extremely high or low percentages in particular race-and-sex groups, and they do not indicate any over-all pattern of elementary vs. secondary level difference.

TABLE IV-3. TEACHERS' OCCUPATIONAL REFERENCE GROUP INDEX BY RACE, SEX, AND LEVEL

Variables and Designated Responses	All Whites % (N)	All Negroes % (N)	All Men % (N)	All Women % (N)	All Elementary % (N)	All Secondary % (N)
Oriented to colleagues (33: 3,4)	29 (6676)	18 (1680)	33 (1616)	26 (6740)	26 (4528)	28 (3828)
Oriented to superiors (33: 1,2)	22 (6676)	24 (1680)	18 (1616)	24 (6740)	24 (4528)	22 (3828)
Oriented to students and parents (33: 5,6)	41 (6676)	48 (1680)	42 (1616)	42 (6740)	42 (4528)	43 (3828)

	WME	WMS	NME	NMS	WFE	WFS	NFE	NFS
Oriented to colleagues	25 (126)	37 (1101)	24 (100)	26 (289)	29 (3409)	26 (2040)	17 (893)	16 (398)
Oriented to superiors	22 (126)	17 (1101)	12 (100)	20 (289)	23 (3409)	24 (2040)	28 (893)	23 (398)
Oriented to students and parents	47 (126)	39 (1101)	54 (100)	47 (289)	40 (3409)	42 (2040)	45 (893)	54 (398)

Absence of holistic service orientation. Distributions of this group of variables are shown in Table IV-4. We have put the matter negatively, looking for the absence of holism rather than for its presence, to keep this table and the discussion of it consistent with other tables where the groups with the highest percentages giving designated responses are the most professional by our definition. The greater the holistic service orientation, the lower is the professionalism, since holistic service orientation is the antithesis of such elements of professionalism as affective neutrality, functional specificity, and universalism. Thus this table, like the rest, is to be read with high percentages indicating high professionalism.

On this set of variables the races, for a change, did not differ with any consistency. Whites tended to have lower holistic service emphasis index scores, but Negroes were less likely to say that spending time with children was their favorite aspect of teaching, and the races were similar in subject orientation and in botherment when they had to give F's.

Men, and secondary teachers, had less holistic service orientation than did women or elementary teachers. This was true in all comparisons in the total sample except that of men vs. women on the holistic service emphasis index; on this, the direction of relationship was consistent with the others but the difference was only 3% and thus not meaningful by our 5% criterion. In the control comparisons involving race-sex-level subcategories, men were more professional (less holistic) than women in 15 of 16 comparisons, and secondary teachers were less holistic than elementary teachers in 14 of 16 comparisons. We discuss these sex and level differences together because they were not independent on each other. The differences tended to be less in the detailed subcategory comparisons than in the total-sample comparisons, indicating that both the sex and the level differences observed in the total sample were partially due to the concentration of men in secondary teaching. The sex and level differences were, moreover, generally cumulative, so that women elementary teachers tended to be the most holistic and male secondary teachers the least so.

Intrinsic work commitment and career satisfaction. Table IV-5 shows distributions of these variables. They turn out to be a rather mixed assortment of items with differing patterns of distribution. Some produce large differences while others do not.

Whites were much more likely than Negroes to have become teachers because they thought the work would be interesting, and to express satisfaction with teaching as a career. These differences persisted and were large within all sex-and-level groups. Whites were also somewhat more inclined to say that their main reason for having remained teachers was that they liked the work; on this item, the differences

TABLE IV-4. TEACHERS' HOLISTIC SERVICE ORIENTATION VARIABLES BY RACE, SEX, AND LEVEL

Variables and Designated Responses	All Whites % (N)	All Negroes % (N)	All Men % (N)	All Women % (N)	All Elementary % (N)	All Secondary % (N)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	42 (7113)	33 (1735)	43 (1717)	40 (7131)	37 (4720)	44 (4128)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	14 (7193)	15 (1777)	24 (1711)	12 (7259)	9 (4822)	20 (4148)
Not bothered by giving an F (item B69: 1)	19 (7334)	22 (1843)	28 (1754)	17 (7423)	15 (4956)	24 (4221)
Time spent with children was not favorite aspect of teaching (29: not B73)	24 (7027)	31 (1579)	31 (1583)	24 (7023)	22 (4665)	29 (3941)

	WME	WMS	NME	NMS	WFE	WFS	NFE	NFS
Low holistic service emphasis index	43 (127)	54 (1191)	41 (100)	34 (299)	37 (3577)	47 (2218)	31 (916)	35 (420)
Subject-oriented	15 (132)	26 (1182)	17 (103)	27 (294)	7 (3639)	19 (2240)	13 (948)	18 (432)
Not bothered by giving an F	22 (134)	30 (1209)	25 (106)	27 (305)	13 (3727)	22 (2264)	20 (989)	24 (443)
Spending time with children was not favorite aspect of teaching	28 (125)	29 (1115)	38 (87)	37 (256)	20 (3601)	27 (2186)	22 (852)	34 (384)

TABLE IV-5. TEACHERS' INTRINSIC WORK COMMITMENT AND CAREER SATISFACTION VARIABLES BY RACE, SEX, AND LEVEL

Variables and Designated Responses	All Whites % (N)	All Negroes % (N)	All Men % (N)	All Women % (N)	All Elementary % (N)	All Secondary % (N)
Became teachers because interested in the work (118:4)	53 (7134)	33 (1789)	51 (1686)	49 (7237)	50 (4844)	48 (4079)
Stayed in teaching because liked the work (26: C12)	85 (7120)	80 (1724)	84 (1672)	84 (7172)	84 (4793)	83 (4051)
High central life interest index (32: 2)	23 (6628)	27 (1646)	26 (1628)	23 (6646)	24 (4410)	23 (3864)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	47 (6049)	46 (1607)	43 (1580)	48 (6076)	50 (3942)	44 (3714)
High career satisfaction (38: 1,2)	82 (7429)	63 (1851)	73 (1752)	80 (7528)	80 (5026)	77 (4254)

	WME	WMS	NME	NMS	WFE	WFS	NFE	NFS
Became teachers because interested in the work	56 (132)	59 (1154)	28 (101)	28 (299)	54 (3657)	48 (2191)	35 (954)	31 (435)
Stayed in teaching because liked the work	86 (127)	86 (1163)	76 (99)	77 (283)	85 (3639)	83 (2191)	82 (928)	80 (414)
High central life interest index	16 (124)	27 (1120)	24 (102)	26 (282)	23 (3320)	20 (2064)	29 (864)	24 (398)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching	43 (102)	46 (1106)	33 (99)	37 (273)	50 (2906)	44 (1935)	52 (835)	40 (400)
High career satisfaction	77 (134)	72 (1210)	59 (106)	59 (302)	84 (3790)	82 (2295)	67 (996)	59 (447)

were fairly sizable among male teachers, quite small but with no reversals of direction among the women. On the other two variables, central life interest index and desire for lifelong teaching careers, the race differences were too small to be considered meaningful in the total sample, and inconsistent in direction when subcategories of teachers were compared. It appears that the Negroes enjoyed teaching considerably less than whites did. Their answers to the occupational choice and career satisfaction questions shown here, and to a lengthy battery of job satisfaction questions to be discussed later, make this plainly evident. That they were as likely as whites to anticipate lifelong teaching careers despite their lower work satisfaction probably means that many Negro men saw no way to get out of teaching into other occupations, and Negro women were under greater financial pressure to keep working than white women were. In short, many Negro teachers appear to have been trapped in careers they did not especially like. Negroes were nevertheless more professional in some attitudes and behaviors than whites were.

A higher percentage of women than of men reported high career satisfaction. This difference was upheld in all subcategories except NS teachers, among whom the sexes did not differ in career satisfaction. Women were also more likely than men to want lifelong classroom teaching careers, but this difference was slightly reversed among WS teachers. Sex differences in commitment to lifelong teaching are hard to interpret in any case, since the alternatives are not the same for the two sexes. Figures not shown in the table indicate that 40% of the women wanted to stop work and become full-time housewives; 36% of the men but only 5% of the women had administrative aspirations; and 21% of the men but only 7% of the women wanted to change to work outside the field of education. (Those who said that the question did not apply to them because they were nearing retirement age were excluded from the sample in calculating these percentages.) On the other three items in this group--choosing the occupation because of interest in the work, staying in it because of interest in the work, and the central life interest index--the men and women were substantially alike. Our general conclusion is that men and women did not differ in any consistent or interpretable way in these indicators of professionalism, except that women other than NS expressed higher career satisfaction.

On four of the five career satisfaction and commitment variables, elementary and secondary teachers were alike. In the total sample, 6% more elementary than secondary teachers wanted lifelong teaching careers, but this difference was reversed among both white and Negro men. We conclude that grade level taught was essentially unrelated to any of the five variables.

The absence of sex differences on the index of work as a central life interest surprised us. We had expected higher index scores among men than among women. We examined this curious similarity by looking at sex distributions of responses to the two separate questionnaire items which composed the index, and to some other questions about interest in family, community, and work, and found that the lack of sex difference on the index was not a matter of men liking community activities more, women liking family activities more, and these two differences canceling each other. Men and women were about the same in their interest in family life, in community activities, and in work. In the process of comparing the men and women on these items, we discovered that the absence of race difference in work as a central life interest did result from the canceling out of race differences in family and community interests. Negroes, especially Negro men, expressed much less interest in family life than whites did, but more interest in community activities; these differences canceled each other to produce racial similarity in work as a central life interest. It is hard to say what these race differences and sex similarities in central life interests may mean, and they may conceivably mean nothing except that the questions were not good ones. To ask someone to choose among family, work, and community activities as a source of general interest to him may be about as meaningful as to ask him to name his favorite Person of the Trinity. He is supposed to like them all.

Job satisfaction. Table IV-6 gives findings about eleven facets of job satisfaction.[2]

The main conclusion to be drawn is that whites were more satisfied with their jobs than Negroes were, according to ten of the eleven variables. On the eleventh variable, saying that teachers had a strong voice in running the school, the races were similar. When Negroes and whites are compared within the four sex-and-level categories with respect to the ten job satisfaction variables which showed over-all race differences--a total of 40 comparisons--only one comparison shows Negroes exceeding whites in satisfaction, this being the liking of colleagues by MS teachers. The largest race differences were in the evaluations of students' and

---

[2] The reader may notice that the N's for variables 41 and 42 are identical. This is neither an error nor a strange coincidence. The figures for both variables were obtained from a computer table which cross-tabulated them. A few cases were lost thereby, but almost certainly not enough to have any material effect on the findings.

TABLE IV-6. TEACHERS' JOB SATISFACTION VARIABLES BY RACE, SEX, AND LEVEL

Variables and Designated Responses	All Whites % (N)	All Negroes % (N)	All Men % (N)	All Women % (N)	All Elementary % (N)	All Secondary % (N)
High current job satisfaction (37: 1,2)	63 (7322)	46 (1791)	58 (1740)	61 (7373)	60 (4920)	60 (4193)
High over-all evaluation of principal (41: 1,2)	62 (7402)	55 (1842)	61 (1761)	60 (7483)	59 (5002)	62 (4242)
Rated principal low in authoritarianism (42: 3,4)	36 (7402)	24 (1842)	38 (1761)	33 (7483)	31 (5002)	37 (4242)
Said teachers had strong voice in running school (144: 1)	24 (7331)	21 (1825)	22 (1745)	24 (7411)	23 (4968)	24 (4188)
Rated principal high in normative compliance (45: 2)	49 (7261)	38 (1822)	44 (1738)	47 (7345)	47 (4903)	47 (4180)
Liked colleagues very well (63: 1)	76 (7448)	70 (1863)	67 (1763)	77 (7547)	79 (5053)	70 (4258)
Did not say inner circle excluded them (68: 1,2,4)	88 (7252)	78 (1813)	81 (1739)	87 (7326)	88 (4900)	83 (4165)
Positively evaluated colleagues' ability (71: 1,2)	71 (7414)	57 (1846)	67 (1754)	68 (7506)	66 (5011)	69 (4249)
Positively evaluated students' attitude (72: 1,2)	45 (7401)	26 (1833)	38 (1748)	42 (7486)	42 (4999)	40 (4235)
Positively evaluated parents' attitude (73: 1,2)	38 (7373)	19 (1828)	27 (1742)	36 (7459)	38 (4980)	30 (4221)
Positively evaluated community's attitude (74: 1,2)	41 (7387)	32 (1829)	34 (1742)	40 (7476)	42 (4982)	35 (4236)

TABLE IV-6. TEACHERS' JOB SATISFACTION VARIABLES BY RACE, SEX, AND LEVEL (continued)

	WME	WMS	NME	NMS	WFE	WFS	NFE	NFS
High current job satisfaction	52 (132)	63 (1205)	4 (104)	44 (299)	64 (3726)	64 (2259)	47 (958)	45 (430)
High over-all evaluation of principal	61 (134)	62 (1216)	55 (107)	60 (304)	61 (3770)	62 (2282)	52 (991)	57 (440)
Rated principal low in authoritarianism	34 (134)	41 (1216)	26 (107)	32 (304)	33 (3770)	38 (2282)	21 (991)	26 (440)
Said teachers had strong voice in running school	25 (133)	28 (1201)	25 (108)	26 (303)	26 (3750)	30 (2247)	27 (977)	30 (437)
Rated principal high in normative compliance	64 (134)	53 (1194)	40 (107)	39 (303)	62 (3685)	59 (2248)	49 (977)	44 (435)
Liked colleagues very well	75 (137)	66 (1215)	66 (106)	69 (306)	82 (3804)	73 (2292)	72 (1006)	68 (445)
Did not say inner circle excluded them	90 (133)	83 (1199)	69 (105)	75 (302)	91 (3688)	84 (2232)	80 (974)	79 (432)
Positively evaluated colleagues' ability	69 (132)	69 (1211)	58 (105)	63 (306)	70 (3785)	72 (2286)	53 (989)	61 (446)
Positively evaluated students' attitude	45 (132)	42 (1210)	29 (105)	19 (301)	46 (3779)	45 (2280)	29 (983)	24 (444)
Positively evaluated parents' attitude	41 (132)	30 (1207)	15 (104)	14 (299)	43 (3760)	34 (2274)	22 (984)	17 (441)
Positively evaluated community's attitude	42 (132)	34 (1206)	39 (104)	29 (300)	45 (3764)	38 (2287)	33 (982)	30 (443)

parents' attitudes. When we view this finding against the fact that nearly half the Negroes named students and parents as their primary reference group, and that they were more likely than whites to do so, their generally low satisfaction with jobs and careers is not surprising. To put the race differences in job satisfaction concretely, a Negro teacher was more likely than a white teacher to report low general satisfaction with her job; to give a poor evaluation of her principal, her colleagues, her students, their parents, and the attitude of the community; to say that she liked her colleagues only moderately well or not much at all; and to feel that her school was dominated by an inner circle of teachers from which she was excluded.

Women exceeded men in job satisfaction according to four variables, men were more satisfied according to one variable, and the two sexes did not differ according to six variables. The sex differences found were generally rather small and were not always upheld within all race-and-level categories. Men were more likely than women to describe their principals as low in authoritarianism. Controlling race and level produces no reversals of this finding, but the sex differences within subcategories were small. Women indicated more satisfaction with colleague relations: they tended to like the other teachers in their schools better than men did, and they were less likely to perceive an inner circle of teachers which excluded them. Women also rated parents and the community higher than men did. The female lead in satisfaction was slightly reversed in evaluation of the community by NE teachers and in liking of colleagues by NS teachers. Thus there was no consistent pattern of more job satisfaction among either male or female teachers, but the sexes did differ in satisfaction with some aspects of their jobs, though not markedly.

Elementary teachers differed from secondary teachers in job satisfaction in precisely the same ways in which women differed from men. The job features with which women were more pleased than men were the same as those with which elementary teachers were more pleased than secondary teachers; and in rating the principal as non-authoritarian, secondary teachers exceeded elementary teachers just as men exceeded women. These findings are not artifacts of each other, since the sex differences generally persisted within level categories and the level differences generally persisted within sex categories. The differences were cumulative, with FE teachers tending to be at one extreme and MS at the other--as was true also of holistic service orientations--although even between these extreme categories the differences (within races) were not especially large. The elementary teachers' lead in liking of colleagues was reversed among NM teachers. Their lesser tendency to feel excluded from an inner circle prevailed only among whites, being reversed among NM teachers and reduced to 1% among NF. Elementary teachers' higher evaluations of parents and the community, and secondary teachers' greater tendency to describe the principal as non-authoritarian, were not reversed in any race-and-sex category. Teachers at the two levels did not differ in the other six job satisfaction variables. The verdict is therefore similar to that regarding sex differences. Elementary and secondary teachers differed in some aspects of job satisfaction, with elementary teachers more often ahead, but they did not differ in job satisfaction as a whole.

Professional behavior. Table IV-7 shows distributions of four different kinds of professionally relevant behaviors. One of them, the consultation of colleagues, does not appear to belong with the other three; its distribution is aberrant from theirs. Accordingly, we shall discuss this variable before we proceed to the discussion of race, sex, and level distributions of the other three behaviors. It appears that questionnaire item C61, which asked, "How often do you ask other teachers for advice about teaching methods or classroom problems," may have been measuring sociability more than professionalism. The response, "often," was given more by women than by men, and more by elementary than by secondary teachers. The effects of sex and level are seen to be, in part, artifacts of each other, from the fact that the differences within control categories were generally smaller than those in the total sample, but they were never reversed. With sex and level both playing a part in explaining the tendency to consult, the teachers who consulted most often were the FE teachers, and those who consulted least were the MS. The FE teachers were, as we have seen, more likely than other teachers to say that they liked their colleagues a lot; but FE teachers, especially WFE, were less professional in a number of ways than other groups were. It thus appears that the item about consultation may have measured sociability more than professionalism. This is not to say that professionals cannot be sociable and like each other, but that sociability and professionalism are different things.

In the other professional behaviors examined--reading index, attenting professional meetings, and voluntarily attending PTA meetings--Negroes far outdid whites. It is conceivable that their more frequent attendance at professional meetings was not entirely voluntary and therefore not a true indicator of professionalism among them. Negro educational organizations may simply have held more meetings, or principals may have forced Negro teachers to attend such meetings as were held. But this is only a matter of conjecture, and the question about the PTA clearly indicated that the more frequent attendance by Negroes in this instance was voluntary. Of the Negroes, 70% said that they went to PTA meetings because they enjoyed them or found them professionally beneficial, whereas nearly hald the whites reported that they attended PTA meetings only because they were forced to, or played hooky. In summary, Negroes stood out as more professional than whites in all the behaviors looked at except consultation of colleagues.

TABLE IV-7. TEACHERS' PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR VARIABLES BY RACE, SEX, AND LEVEL

Variables and Designated Responses	All Whites % (N)	All Negroes % (N)	All Men % (N)	All Women % (N)	All Elementary % (N)	All Secondary % (N)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	30 (7293)	53 (1837)	38 (1751)	33 (7379)	34 (4904)	35 (4226)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	18 (7459)	19 (1866)	12 (1771)	19 (7554)	21 (5055)	15 (4270)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	38 (6733)	71 (1636)	48 (1667)	44 (6702)	46 (4376)	43 (3993)
Voluntarily attended PTA meetings (item B57: 1,2)	53 (7132)	70 (1809)	53 (1689)	57 (7252)	62 (4863)	49 (4078)

	WME	WMS	NME	NMS	WFE	WFS	NFE	NFS
High reading index	33 (133)	34 (1212)	50 (109)	56 (297)	29 (3676)	29 (2272)	52 (986)	55 (445)
Consulted colleagues often	17 (136)	11 (1220)	20 (108)	13 (307)	20 (3806)	17 (2297)	22 (1005)	16 (446)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings	36 (124)	42 (1156)	72 (101)	71 (286)	38 (3313)	36 (2140)	73 (838)	67 (411)
Voluntarily attended PTA meetings	60 (129)	47 (1160)	67 (104)	69 (296)	59 (3662)	44 (2181)	73 (968)	64 (441)

Men did better than women in the reading index in the total sample, but this sex difference was reversed among NE teachers and was small in other subcategories. Men and women did not differ in attendance at professional or PTA meetings. Our general interpretation is that neither sex was more professional in behavior than the other.

Substantially the same can be said of elementary and secondary teachers, except that elementary teachers were 13% more likely to say that they attended PTA meetings voluntarily. This difference was slightly reversed among NM teachers but persisted, with magnitudes from 9% to 15%, in the other three race-and-level categories.

Before all these race, sex, and level differences in various aspects of professionalism are summed up, one further item not shown in the tables may be of interest. In response to the final item in the teacher questionnaire, 74% of the Negroes as contrasted with 53% of the whites said that they had found the questionnaire "very interesting." Most of the rest said that the questionnaire was "somewhat interesting." About 1% of the Negroes and not quite 5% of the whites described it as "not interesting." The sexes and grade levels did not differ appreciably in their answers to this question.

Summary of race, sex, and level differences. Table IV-8 summarizes the previous seven tables. Whenever one racial group rated generally higher than the other with respect to a category of variables, this fact is indicated with the initial letter (W or N) of the race which was more professional. The same procedure is used to indicate sex differences (M vs. F) and level differences (E vs. S). Blank spaces indicate similarities. Two plusses after the initial of a race, sex, or level mean that the differences were highly consistent, applying to most of the variables in the set and holding up under controls. One plus indicates less consistent relationships, those which applied to only some of the variables and those which were reversed fairly often within control categories. The assignment of plusses is somewhat impressionistic, but the interested reader can satisfy himself of its general accuracy by inspecting the details of Tables IV-1 through IV-7, which are the basis for Table IV-8. The denominators of the fractions below the initials and plusses are the numbers of subcategory control comparisons which were made, always four times the number of variables in the set. The numerators of the fractions are the frequencies with which the designated groups led in professionalism in these control comparisons. For example, the 7/8 under "race" for knowledge orientation means that Negroes had more knowledge orientation than whites--though not necessarily as much as 5% more--in seven of eight comparisons within sex-and-level categories. Consistency of

TABLE IV-8. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RACES, BETWEEN SEXES, AND BETWEEN LEVELS IN SELECTED PROFESSIONALLY RELEVANT ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS

	Group Which Was More Professional, Consistency of Difference (++ vs. +), and Proportion of Control Comparisons within Which Prevailing Relation was Upheld		
Type of Attitude or Behavior	Race	Sex	Level
Knowledge orientation	N++ 7/8		
Autonomy and colleague group power orientation	N+ 8/12		S+ 10/12
Colleague reference group orientation	W++ 4/4	M+ 3/4	
Absence of holistic service orientation		M++ 15/16	S++ 14/16
Intrinsic work commitment and career satisfaction	W+ 16/20		
Job satisfaction	W++ 40/44		
Professional behavior	N++ 12/12		

relationships across different variables and control categories, rather than how large the differences were, is the basis for assigning plusses and minusses; but usually, though not always, the double-plus differences were the largest as well as the most consistently upheld.

The summary table shows that whites and Negroes differed in six of the seven attitude and behavior sets examined, and that four of these six race differences were highly consistent across different variables and sex-and-level control categories. Negroes led in knowledge orientation, autonomy and colleague group power orientation, and professional behavior. On the other hand, whites were ahead in colleague reference group orientation, intrinsic work commitment and career satisfaction, and job satisfaction. With each racial group ahead in three ways, we cannot say unequivocally that either was more professional; but perhaps the Negroes come off a bit better, particularly if we take the view that behavior is more important than attitudes. The greater dissatisfaction of Negroes was, however, very pronounced.

Men and women differed consistently in only one respect, but an important one to which we shall return in later chapters. Women were more likely to have holistic service orientations. (The table shows men more professional by virtue of their relative lack of such orientations.)

Secondary teachers were less likely to have holistic service orientations than were elementary teachers. In addition, though with less consistency, secondary teachers were more oriented to autonomy and colleague group power.

In short, the races differed in nearly all respects but it was not always the same race which gave the more professional responses. The sexes were more often similar than different, but men were the more professional sex in the one instance where the sexes differed consistently. The grade-level patterns resembled the sex differences, with elementary teachers of both sexes tending to be distinguished by the same characteristics as women. The biggest differences observed were racial, with Negroes more oriented to knowledge and more professional in behavior but whites more satisfied.

Age

Table IV-9 compares teachers 39 years old and younger with those 40 and older with respect to 19 variables. Responses of the young and old within race-sex-level categories are not shown, but will be commented upon in instances when the age groups differed by 5% or more in the total sample.

TABLE IV-9. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINETEEN VARIABLES, BY AGE

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	39 and Younger % (N)	40 and Older % (N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	60 (4533)	64 (4634)
Favored education required of teachers (19: 4,5)	68 (4515)	69 (4616)
High professional zeal index (20: 4,5,6)	61 (4466)	72 (4526)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	42 (4572)	38 (4701)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	54 (4431)	53 (4370)
Did not oppose controversial activity (104: 1,2)	79 (4551)	68 (4709)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	30 (4175)	24 (4198)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	44 (4421)	37 (4439)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	18 (4448)	12 (4535)
Not bothered by giving an F (item B69: 1)	27 (4516)	12 (4675)
Stayed in teaching because liked the work (26: C12)	83 (4431)	85 (4423)
High central life interest index (32: 2)	22 (4185)	25 (4103)
Had considered no occupations other than teaching (116: 9)	34 (4356)	56 (4481)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	36 (4446)	62 (3258)
Very high career satisfaction (38:1)	31 (4561)	39 (4734)
Read in subject matter ten or more hours a month (14: 4,5)	48 (4549)	44 (4641)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	31 (4535)	38 (4614)

TABLE IV-9. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINETEEN VARIABLES, BY AGE
(continued)

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	39 and Younger % (N)	40 and Older % (N)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	19 (4584)	17 (4755)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	42 (4231)	47 (4147)

In the total sample, the young teachers were more professional than the old with respect to five variables indicating orientation to autonomy and colleague group power, colleague reference group orientation, and low holistic service orientation. Young teachers were more likely to view controversial activity favorably or neutrally, in the total sample and in all eight race-sex-level categories. The age groups did not, however, differ in favoring policy involvement or in bureaucratic submission. The young were more oriented than the old to colleagues as their primary reference group, and this difference was reversed only among NME teachers. Three variables produced differences in holistic service orientation, though only among secondary teachers in one instance. The young were more than twice as likely as the old to say that giving an F did not bother them; in no control subcategory did this difference disappear. The young made lower holistic service emphasis index scores in the total sample and in six of eight control comparisons, the exceptions being a reversal among NMS teachers and an absence of any difference among NFS. The total-sample difference in subject orientation persisted in all categories of secondary teachers, but was reversed among NME, WFE, and NFE teachers.

Teachers over 40 led in six variables concerned with knowledge orientation, career commitment and satisfaction, and professional behavior. Their lead in five of these six instances was maintained in six or more of the eight race-sex-level categories, but one of the differences should not be taken to mean that older teachers were more professional, for reasons we shall indicate. The old had higher professional zeal index scores, in the total sample and in all control subcategories except NMS, among whom the young were ahead, and WME, among whom the young and old were equally likely to make high scores on this index. It should be noted that this index is an amalgam of variables 18 and 19, on which the old led by less than 5%, and variable 17, attitude toward professional organizations, on which we neglected to run a table. The sizable index score difference probably reflects a large lead by the old in favorableness of attitude toward professional organizations, so it is questionable whether this finding can be accepted as an indication of more knowledge orientation among older teachers. The old led in all three variables concerned with career commitment and satisfaction, but one of these differences held up only among women, and one cannot be considered an indication of professionalism among older teachers. The much greater tendency of the old to have considered no occupations other than teaching held up in all eight control comparisons. So did their lead in wanting lifelong teaching careers, but this may mean only that the members of their age group who had wanted to get out had done so. (This finding does, of course, mean what it literally shows, that old teachers were the most content to remain in the classroom until retirement age.) The higher career satisfaction of the old observed in the total sample persisted in all four control categories of women teachers; but among the men, it was reversed among WMS and NME and the age groups were tied among WME. The old were more professional in behavior according to two of four professional behavior variables. Their lead in reading index scores persisted in all control categories, and their lead in attending professional meetings was reversed only among NME teachers.

To sum up, these findings show somewhat more orientation to autonomy and colleague group power, more colleague reference group orientation, and less holistic service orientation among young teachers than among those over 40. They show somewhat greater career commitment and satisfaction, more professional behavior, and perhaps more knowledge orientation among the older teachers.

Father's Occupation

Do teachers from different social class and community backgrounds differ in prfessionalism? The next two tables explore this question. Table IV-10 classifies teachers by their fathers' (or stepfathers') occupations (variable 11) and compares the distributions of 19 variables among teachers whose fathers were in white-collar, agricultural, and blue-collar occupations. The question on father's occupation (teacher questionnaire item D10) asked about the father's or stepfather's "main job or occupation while you were growing up," and asked the respondent to check "Y" if no father or stepfather lived with her while she was growing up. The Y's were eliminated from all tabulations involving father's occupation along with teachers who did not answer the question. There were too few WME and NME teachers in some father's-occupation categories for us to look at comparisons among these ME teachers--too few being arbitrarily defined as 24 or fewer--but father's-occupation comparisons can be made in the other six race-sex-level categories, and will be commented upon when 5% differences are found in the entire sample.

Teachers with white-collar fathers had the lowest professional zeal index scores, in the total sample and in all six race-sex-level categories within which the comparisons could be made.

Teachers from farming backgrounds were the least professional of the three groups according to three variables representing two general aspects of professionalism, orientation to autonomy and colleague group power and holism. They were the group least likely to be strongly favorable to policy involvement, in the total sample and in all subcategories examined except WFS. They were more likely than other teachers to oppose controversial activity, except among NMS. They were more bothered by giving F's than other teachers were. This last finding was not true of NMS or NFS teachers but was true in the four categories of MS and WE teachers--i.e., more often than would be expected by chance--

TABLE IV-10. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINETEEN VARIABLES, BY FATHER'S OCCUPATION

Variables, Variables Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	White Collar % (N)	Agri-culture % (N)	Blue Collar % (N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	60 (3569)	63 (2899)	64 (2292)
Favored education required of teachers (19: 4,5)	67 (3553)	68 (2897)	71 (2276)
High professional zeal index (20: 4,5,6)	62 (3502)	70 (2846)	68 (2251)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	40 (3616)	37 (2941)	44 (2305)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	54 (3433)	54 (2780)	51 (2214)
Did not oppose controversial activity (104: 1,2)	77 (3616)	69 (2936)	74 (2298)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	29 (3239)	25 (2654)	27 (2125)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	42 (3456)	38 (2800)	40 (2217)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	15 (3512)	13 (2824)	16 (2243)
Not bothered by giving an F (item B69: 1)	19 (3573)	17 (2920)	22 (2278)
Stayed in teaching because liked the work (26: C12)	84 (3469)	85 (2776)	83 (2204)
High central life interest index (32: 2)	22 (3233)	24 (2598)	24 (2096)
Had considered no occupations other than teaching (116: 9)	43 (3457)	53 (2804)	39 (2192)

TABLE IV-10. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINETEEN VARIABLES, BY FATHER'S OCCUPATION
(continued)

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	White Collar % (N)	Agri-culture % (N)	Blue Collar % (N)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	45 (3028)	52 (2301)	45 (2049)
Very high career satisfaction (38: 1)	36 (3619)	35 (2958)	33 (2298)
Read in subject matter ten or more hours a month (14: 4,5)	43 (3587)	45 (2909)	48 (2286)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	31 (3574)	36 (2891)	37 (2276)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	18 (3631)	17 (2960)	19 (2323)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	41 (3302)	45 (2650)	49 (2106)

with three categories of teachers being compared six times. On these three variables, teachers with blue-collar fathers were at the opposite, more professional, end of the distribution from those with agricultural fathers, but the blue-collar findings were more often reversed than upheld when race, sex, and level were controlled.

Another way in which the teachers from agricultural backgrounds stood out was that they were considerably more likely than other teachers to say that they had never considered entering any occupations but teaching. In this respect they led in all six instances where comparisons could be made within race-sex-level categories, their leads being especially large among the four female categories.

From the figures for the total sample, it would appear that teachers with white-collar fathers were the least professional in behavior, and that those with blue-collar fathers were the most so. Patterns of somewhat this kind appear in the data on subject matter reading, the reading index, and attendance at professional meetings. But none of these patterns held up with any consistency when race, sex, and level were controlled. The differences which appear in the total sample to have been associated with father's occupation turn out, when control subcategories of teachers are examined, to have been race differences. A much higher percentage of Negro teachers (51%) than of whites (20%) had blue-collar fathers, and a much higher percentage of whites (45%) than of Negroes (22%) had white-collar fathers, with the result that the blue-collar teachers led, in the total sample, in professional behaviors in which Negroes led whites. (Teachers with agricultural fathers included 35% of the whites and 26% of the Negroes.)

In summary, teachers from farming backgrounds trailed in two aspects of professionalism--absence of holistic orientation, and orientation to autonomy and colleague group power--but led in not having considered occupations other than teaching. White-collar teachers had the lowest professional zeal index scores. Seeming differences in professional behavior were spurious, being accounted for by race differences coupled with the higher status backgrounds of white than of Negro teachers.

Community Origin

Teachers were classified by the sizes of the communities where they grew up, from questionnaire item F40, as is explained in Appendix C; the number given this variable is #11. Table IV-11 compares the distributions of 19 variables among teachers from rural, town, city, and metropolitan backgrounds. There were again too few male elementary

TABLE IV-11. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINETEEN VARIABLES, BY COMMUNITY ORIGIN

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Rural % (N)	Town % (N)	City % (N)	Metropolitan % (N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	63 (5504)	61 (2221)	62 (951)	64 (550)
Favored education required of teachers (19: 4,5)	68 (5469)	70 (2219)	67 (949)	68 (549)
High professional zeal index (20: 4,5,6)	69 (5381)	65 (2189)	62 (931)	57 (544)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	38 (5565)	41 (2249)	47 (967)	51 (559)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	54 (5276)	52 (2133)	51 (913)	58 (539)
Did not oppose controversial activity (104: 1,2)	70 (5572)	76 (2241)	79 (967)	83 (558)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	26 (5024)	28 (2039)	29 (871)	26 (502)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	38 (5301)	43 (2156)	43 (923)	42 (530)
Subject-oriented (162: 1,2,3)	13 (5367)	15 (2181)	16 (940)	16 (543)
Not bothered by giving an F (item B69: 1)	18 (5524)	19 (2232)	26 (955)	28 (544)
Stayed in teaching because liked the work (26: C12)	84 (5302)	84 (2160)	83 (928)	82 (527)
High central life interest indes (32: 2)	24 (4935)	23 (2033)	25 (859)	24 (514)
Had considered no occupations other than teaching (116: 9)	50 (5309)	42 (2133)	33 (927)	35 (535)

TABLE IV-11. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO NINETEEN VARIABLES, BY COMMUNITY ORIGIN (continued)

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Rural % (N)	Town % (N)	City % (N)	Metro-politan % (N)
Wanted lifelong careers in teaching (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	51 (4478)	46 (1921)	39 (842)	39 (495)
Very high career satisfaction (38: 1)	36 (5597)	35 (2247)	33 (965)	32 (556)
Read in subject matter ten or more hours a month (14: 4,5)	46 (5513)	46 (2229)	47 (963)	41 (556)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	35 (5482)	35 (2219)	36 (959)	28 (553)
Consulted colleagues often (item C61: 1)	18 (5619)	19 (2255)	19 (971)	14 (556)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	44 (4990)	43 (2049)	54 (880)	50 (519)

teachers of either race for us to compare teachers from different kinds of communities within these categories, but the other six race-sex-level categories contained enough teachers from all four community backgrounds to allow the comparisons when the data for the total sample revealed differences. (There were, for example, only four WME teachers with metropolitan backgrounds in our sample of more than 9,000 teachers.)

Two of the three knowledge orientation variables reveal no differences, but the professional zeal index was distributed in a very neat pattern: the larger the community in which a teacher had grown up, the less likely she was to score high in professional zeal. Teachers from rural backgrounds had the highest scores in five of the six race-sex-level categories where the comparison could be made, the exception being NFS teachers. Teachers who had grown up in metropolitan communities had the lowest zeal index scores in five of six subcategories, the exception this time being NMS.

The pattern was almost as clear-cut with respect to orientation to autonomy and colleague group power, but in this case it was the teachers from larger communities who were the most professional. On the variables concerning policy involvement and controversial activity, professionalism rose consistently as the community of origin became larger, though the difference between teachers from the extreme community origin categories, rural and metropolitan, was only 13% in each case. In strongly favoring policy involvement, teachers from rural backgrounds ranked lowest among WMS, WFE, and NFE teachers, and second lowest among WFS; but they ranked second highest among NMS and highest among NFS, so that the pattern did not hold among teachers in Negro secondary schools. Metropolitan teachers led in strongly favoring policy involvement among WFE, WFS, and NFE teachers and ranked second among WMS and NFS, but ranked lowest among NMS. The pattern of greater professionalism among teachers from larger communities was still more consistently evident with respect to variable 104, the percentage who did not oppose controversial activity by teachers. On this variable, teachers from rural communities ranked lowest except among NMS teachers, among whom they were second lowest, and teachers from metropolitan backgrounds ranked highest in four control categories and second highest among WFE and WFS. Even the bureaucratic submission index produced a difference for a change. The pattern was less neat than the two just discussed, but again the teachers from metropolitan backgrounds came out most professional, though the other three groups were alike. Respondents who had grown up in metropolitan communities ranked lowest in bureaucratic submission--i.e., highest in the percentage not submissive--among NMS, WFE, WFS, and NFS teachers and second highest among WMS, the pattern being seriously fractured only by their ranking second lowest among the NFE.

Data on two of the three holistic service orientation variables, the exception being subject orientation, give evidence that teachers who had grown up in large communities were the most professional. The differences on the holistic service emphasis index were small, with only the teachers from rural backgrounds differing from the rest in the total sample; but this difference was consistently upheld in race-sex-level categories, teachers from rural backgrounds being the most holistic in five of six comparisons and the second most holistic among NMS. In being bothered by giving F's, teachers from rural areas and small towns were alike, and teachers from cities and metropolitan communities were alike, but the two groups from smaller communities were more likely to feel bothered than were the two groups from larger communities. Those from either rural or town origins ranked lowest in saying that giving F's did not bother them in five of six comparisons; the exception was WMS teachers. The least bothered were those from either city or metropolitan backgrounds in all six race-sex-level categories.

Career commitment was greatest among those who had come from small communities, according to the answers to questions which asked if teachers had considered other occupations and if they wanted lifelong careers in the classroom. On both of these variables the teachers from rural backgrounds ranked highest, those from city and metropolitan backgrounds ranked low and were similar to each other, and teachers from town backgrounds were intermediate. In not having considered other occupations, teachers from rural backgrounds ranked first in five comparisons and second among NMS teachers. Teachers from either city or metorpolitan backgrounds ranked last in all six comparisons of the percentages who had never considered other occupations. The total-sample relation of small community origin to lifelong classroom teaching commitment held up among women but not among men. Among the women, whites (WFE and WFS) from rural backgrounds ranked first in lifelong teaching commitment, while Negroes (NFE and NFS) from rural backgrounds stood second among the community-origin categories in this respect. The teaching career commitments were distributed quite differently among men. In the two male categories with N's large enough to make comparisons feasible, teachers with city backgrounds ranked first in lifelong teaching commitment among the WMS, and those with metropolitan backgrounds ranked first among the NMS.

Teachers from metropolitan backgrounds stood lowest by three measures of professional behavior: subject matter reading, the reading index (which includes subject matter reading), and consulting colleagues. Teachers who grew up in communities in the two larger size categories, city and metropolitan, attended more meetings than did those from rural or town origins, but this relationship observed in the total sample persisted only within the WFE and NFE categories and did not persist in the other categories when race, sex, and level were controlled. The low rating of teachers from metropolitan communities in reading and consultation was upheld rather consistently within control categories, despite the fact that the differences in these variables observed in the total sample were small. Those who had grown up in metropolitan communities did the least subject matter reading in all subcategories except NMS, had the lowest reading index scores in all six subcategories, and reported the least consultation of other teachers in four of six race-sex-level categories and the second least among NFE and NFS teachers.

Community origin made no difference in colleague reference group origin.

To summarize, professional zeal declined as the size of the community in which the teacher had been reared rose. The opposite relation of community origin to orientation to autonomy and colleague group power prevailed; the larger was the community of origin, the more likely the teachers was to be professional in this respect. In absence of holistic service orientation, teachers from rural backgrounds were the least professional category and those from city or metropolitan backgrounds were the most professional--i.e., the least holistic. Teachers from rural backgrounds ranked high, and those from city or metropolitan backgrounds low, in the percentages who had never considered any occupation except teaching; a similar relation of community origin to lifelong classroom teaching commitment prevailed among women but not among men. Teachers from metropolitan backgrounds were the least professional in behavior; the other three categories did not differ in professional behavior.

In general, though with some specific exceptions, teachers who had grown up in rural communities stood out from the rest in the same ways as did teachers whose fathers were farmers. These teachers were long on professional zeal and career commitment but short on orientation to autonomy and power of the colleague group, and they were relatively unprofessional in being more oriented to holistic service than other teachers were. The similarities of these two categories of teachers are not surprising, but they are two different categories and we thus have two sets of findings, not just one. There were 5504 teachers, more than half the sample, with rural backgrounds, but only 2899 of them said that their fathers were in agricultural occupations. It would have been desirable for us to look separately at teachers from agricultural and nonagricultural rural backgrounds, but it did not occur to us to do so in time to include the analysis in this report. In the future it will no longer be possible for so many teachers to come from farms, since there are not many farm families left in the United States, but it is not unlikely that rural nonfarm families will continue to supply a large quota of teachers.

"Highly Professional" Teachers

Following a procedure which is described under variable 76 in Appendix C, we identified a small cadre of teachers who were defined as "highly professional" on the basis of their possessing eight characteristics.

The teachers identified as "highly professional" were moderate or high in the evaluation they placed on their careers as a central life interest; they were heavy readers of professional materials; they had favorable attitudes toward professional organizations, professional self-improvement, and educational requirements for teachers; they had stayed in teaching more because of interest in the work than for the status or money it brought them; they were satisfied with teaching as a career; and they planned lifelong careers in teaching or school administration.

The purpose of developing this variable, and of tabulating relations of other variables to it, was to discover the characteristics of highly professional teachers. It was felt that they might tend to come disproportionately from certain kinds of backgrounds, to have typical attitudes, or to work in certain kinds of schools. The purpose was not well accomplished, for hardly any of the large number of variables we examined were related to teachers' being highly professional by the stringent criteria described above. Lengthy tabulations produced mainly negative results.

Table IV-12 shows the relationships, such as they were, or being highly professional to race, sex, and level. In the total sample, sex and level were not related to this measure of professionalism. Race almost was, by our customary 5% criterion, with 4% more Negroes than whites being designated highly professional; but the race differences were very small among male teachers, and exceeded 5% only among the FS.

Looking at the eight subcategories in Table IV-12 separately, we find some fairly substantial differences. The range was from 7% highly professional among WME, WFE, and WFS teachers to 13% among NFS. This is a range of only 6% but at the same time the NFS teachers had nearly twice the percentage of highly professional teachers that was found in the three lowest categories.

Having noted these differences among race-sex-level subcategories, we have said almost all there is to say about variables related to being highly professional. We looked at 47 other independent variables, and only four of them produced differences as large as 5% in the likelihood that a teacher would be highly professional. In two of these four instances, one of the eight components used in identifying the highly professional, future career commitment, probably accounts for the differences found. These instances involve the amount of education a teacher had had (variable 4) and the teacher's age (variable 10).

Of teachers who had taken graduate courses beyond the bachelor's degree, 12% were highly professional, as contrasted with 6% of those who had not completed bachelor's degrees and 6% of those with bachelor's degrees but no graduate work. This finding probably reflects the relationship between future career commitment and graduate study. Teachers

TABLE IV-12. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS "HIGHLY PROFESSIONAL," BY RACE, SEX, AND LEVEL

All Whites % (N)	All Negroes % (N)	All Men % (N)	All Women % (N)	All Elementary % (N)	All Secondary % (N)
7 (7487)	11 (1882)	9 (1777)	7 (7592)	7 (5080)	8 (4289)

WME	WMS	NME	NMS	WFE	WFS	NFE	NFS
7 (138)	9 (1221)	10 (109)	11 (309)	7 (3821)	7 (2307)	10 (1012)	13 (452)

who expect to remain in teaching and those who wish to become principals must take graduate work to renew and upgrade their teaching certificates or qualify for administrative positions.

Teachers in their 20's differed from those over 30, with 4% of the youngest group and 9% of the older teachers highly professional. Age made virtually no difference once a teacher was beyond 30. Again, future career commitment probably accounts for the difference. A large percentage of the younger women expected to stop work to be housewives, and a large percentage of the younger men expected to leave the field of education, with the result that young men and women were relatively unlikely to be classified highly professional. Among the teachers over 30, the ranks had been thinned by the departure of housewives and disgruntled men, so that those remaining had higher career commitment and were more likely to be designated highly professional than was the case in the youngest group.

Variable 60, the amount of professional zeal attributed to other teachers in one's school as measured by a three-item index (see Appendix C), produced a sizable difference in the likelihood that a teacher would be designated highly professional. Of teachers with index scores of 4 to 6, 13% were highly professional, but only 5% of those with scores of 3 or lower were so designated. This difference was completely consistent when race, sex, and level were controlled, exceeding 5% in all eight subcategories of teachers. This finding is due to the very high association of the professional zeal index to three items in the index of the highly professional. To be called highly professional, a teacher had to express favorable attitudes toward professional organizations, professional self-improvement, and education required of teachers. The attributed professional zeal index indicates the extent to which the teachers attributed these same attitudes to other teachers in their schools.

The fourth difference found is not so easily explained (or explained away) as the previous three, and seems to be a genuine finding rather than an artifact of the way in which the highly professional teachers were defined. The variable involved is consultation by other teachers (#61). Of the respondents who said that other teachers asked them often for advice about teaching methods or classroom problems, 12% were highly professional. The percentage among those who said that they were consulted less often was only half as large, 6%. This difference was sustained in seven of eight race-sex-level categories, the exception being WME teachers, among whom it was reversed. Similarly, being consulted by the principal (variable 50) made a difference. Of those who said that the principal consulted them about school matters affecting them once a month or more, 10% were highly professional, whereas the percentage was only 6% among those whose principals consulted them less than once a month or not at all. This latter difference does not pass our 5% meaningfulness test; but together with the finding about consultation by other teachers, it appears to suggest that a feeling of inclusion in the group and of being thought important enough to consult produces professionalism as we are now defining it.

Examination of the relationship of numerous other variables to being highly professional generated a parade of negative results. The other variables looked at dealt with personal characteristics and social backgrounds of teachers, their involvement in their communities, their job satisfaction, characteristics of their communities and school systems, and characteristics of their schools.

Specifically, when teachers were classified by the following individual variables, different categories of teachers did not differ by as much as 5% in the likelihood of being highly professional in a single instance: age, subject taught, community origin, other occupations considered, number of teachers in childhood family, attended teacher's vs. non-teacher's college, marital status, spouse's occupation, amount of social participation, occupational community, extreme occupational community, local voluntary association memberships, time spent in local voluntary associations, local associations belonged to because teacher, evaluation of colleagues, student attitude, parents' attitude, community attitude, job features index, principal's authoritarianism index, principal's normative compliance index, teacher voice in running school, attraction to colleagues index.

In addition, no relationships were found between being highly professional and the size of the community, community facilities and size halves, number of teachers in school, or any of the following school context measures: attributed school professional zeal index, subject vs. child orientation, colleague reference group orientation, policy involvement, attitude toward controversial activity, future career commitment of women teachers in school (examined among the men only, since this variable was related to being highly professional by definition among the women), consultation by other teachers, attraction to colleagues index, absence of inner circle, evaluation of colleagues, student attitude, parents' attitude, community attitude, job features index, perceived social class of students, days attending professional meetings.

From these negative results concerning school context measures, a positive interpretation is possible. Differing school atmospheres are not the explanation for the few relationships of individual characteristics to being highly professional that were found. For example, the individual measures of consultation by other teachers and attributed professional zeal were related to being highly professional, but the school context counterparts of these variables were not. Future career commitment was a part of the definition of the highly professional, but the career commitment of women teachers in a school had no effect on the probability the the school's male teachers would be highly professional. These findings reinforce a general conclusion from data given in Chapter III, that when teachers are professional, it is usually because of characteristics they have brought to their jobs or because of idiosyncratic work experiences they have had, not because the atmospheres of their schools have made them professional.

CHAPTER V

IF TEACHERS ARE NOT PROFESSIONALS, WHAT ARE THEY?

Most teachers, we have argued in Chapter III, are not professionals. Their motivations are not those of the professional person, who has a strong intrinsic commitment to a career in which he applies specialized knowledge in an affectively neutral manner and who demands, if necessary, the autonomy he needs to apply it as he thinks best. All of our evidence indicates that while a substantial minority of the teachers we studied could be described as professional, most could not. If the motivations and behaviors of teachers are not chiefly professional, what are they? What motivates teachers? What aspects of their work bring them satisfaction?

The thesis of this chapter is that to many and perhaps most teachers, teaching is more a job than a profession. By this we mean that it is an occupation which lacks, in ways we have already shown, some of the attributes we would expect to find in a profession, and we mean a bit more. A job is work which one does because it is necessary to bring home money. A jobholder wants pleasant and easy working conditions more than he wants difficult challenges. Data already given indicate that a rather low percentage of the teachers we studied claimed to have chosen the occupation because of intrinsic interest in the work. Many of the women hoped to stop work and become housewives, most of the men aspired to leave the classroom and become administrators, and the teachers gave less evidence of satisfaction with their careers than has been found in professions such as law, medicine, and science.

In the pages which follow, we present evidence to support the assertion that teachers view their work more as a job than as a profession, by showing that the ones we studied wanted the kinds of role-set relations which made life pleasant and easy, but were not made more professional by the presence of these conditions. The general hypothesis is that teachers whose role-set relations gave opportunities for sociability and protected them against harsh demands would be more satisfied than other teachers with their jobs, but not more professional. The aspects of role-set relations examined are participation in local voluntary associations because of being teachers (variable #110), being consulted by other teachers (#61), friendly informal association with the principal (#47), lack of authoritarianism on the part of the principal (#42), and the variable we have called normative compliance (#45), the principal's ability as a disciplinarian and his willingness to back up teachers in disputes with parents.

TABLE V-1. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS WHO SAID THAT THEIR JOBS WERE BETTER THAN MOST TEACHING POSITIONS, BY SELECTED ASPECTS OF ROLE-SET RELATIONS

Aspects of Role-Set Relations	Pleased with Jobs %	(N)
Belonged to one or more local voluntary associations because of being a teacher (110)	61	(3348)
Did not	59	(6129)
Were asked for advice often by other teachers (61:1)	65	(2491)
Were not (61: 2,3,4)	58	(6909)
Said principal often associated informally with teachers (47: 1)	68	(3946)
Said principal associated informally with reachers from time to time (47: 2)	58	(4060)
Said principal rarely or never associated informally with teachers (47: 3,4)	42	(1405)
Principal low in authoritarianism (42: 3,4)	76	(3184)
Principal medium in authoritarianism (42: 2)	64	(2466)
Principal high in authoritarianism (42: 0,1)	44	(3734)
Principal high in normative compliance (45: 2)	73	(4358)
Principal medium in normative compliance (45: 1)	56	(2487)
Principal low in normative compliance (45: 0)	41	(2424)

Table V-1 shows the relationships of these variables to the satisfaction the teachers expressed with their current teaching positions. The percentages indicate how many teachers, of those who described their role-set relations in the ways shown on the left side of the table, said that their current teaching jobs were better than most. In every instance but one--the exception was belonging to local associations because of being teachers--sociable or supportive role-set relations increased the job satisfaction of teachers. The effects on job satisfaction of having principals who were not socially distant, who were not authoritarian, and who were rated high in normative compliance were among the strongest differences we have found in this study. All of the differences found in the total sample were also present in all eight race-sex-level subcategories of teachers.

The remaining tables in the chapter, along with some data already reported in Chapter III, show that these same role-set relationships tended not to make any difference in the professionalism of teachers, with a few exceptions which will be noted.

Belonging to local associations was the only one of the role-set variables which did not have an effect on job satisfaction. Table V-2 shows that belonging to local associations was also unrelated to any of seven elements of professionalism examined, except attending professional meetings. The difference made in this instance was only 5%, but it persisted in all control categories except WFE teachers, among whom it was reversed by less than 1%. It is questionable whether this finding should be taken to mean that one aspect of role-set relationships led to professionalism with respect to another, or simply that some teachers, like some other people, are joiners by nature.

The relations between variable 61, consultation by other teachers, and the aspects of professionalism which are the dependent variables in the present chapter have already been shown in Chapter III. It was indicated there that being asked often for advice was positively associated with favoring self-improvement, with the reading index, and with attendance at professional meetings, but was negatively associated with the absence of holistic orientation and was unrelated to other professional variables.

Table V-3 relates the social distance of the principal to the professionalism of teachers. The principal's social distance was not related to teachers' colleague reference group orientation, the holistic service emphasis index, the reading index, or frequency of attending professional meetings. Three relationships were found, two of which suggested a positive effect of favorable role-set relations on professionalism and one of which suggested a negative effect.

TABLE V-2. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO SEVEN VARIABLES, BY WHETHER THEY BELONGED TO LOCAL VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS BECAUSE OF BEING TEACHERS (VARIABLE 110)

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Belonged		Did Not Belong	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	63	(3355)	61	(6069)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	48	(3229)	46	(5810)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	28	(3063)	26	(5543)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	39	(3267)	41	(5832)
Wanted lifelong teaching careers (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	46	(2685)	48	(5209)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	34	(3347)	35	(6068)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	48	(3151)	43	(5464)

TABLE V-3. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO SEVEN VARIABLES, BY PRINCIPAL'S SOCIAL DISTANCE (VARIABLE 47)

	Principal Associated Informally with Teachers					
	Often		From Time to Time		Rarely or Never	
Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	63	(3916)	63	(4046)	58	(1394)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	51	(3730)	54	(3897)	58	(1354)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	27	(3575)	27	(3706)	27	(1293)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	39	(3784)	41	(3913)	42	(1346)
Wanted lifelong teaching careers (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	49	(3234)	48	(3390)	43	(1210)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	35	(3921)	34	(4034)	34	(1395)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	46	(3597)	44	(3683)	44	(1279)

The more often a principal was said to associate informally with his teachers--i.e., the less his social distance--the more likely the teachers were to favor professional self-improvement. In this respect the teachers who said that their principals often associated with teachers did not differ from those who said that their principals associated with teachers informally from time to time, but both of these groups were more likely to favoe professional self-improvement than were the teachers who said that their principals rarely or never associated with them informally. This difference was upheld in all four categories of women teachers but not in the two categories of male teachers, WMS and NMS, within which the N's were large enough to allow the comparison to be made. (By a large enough N we mean one of 25 or more, as in previous chapters.) There were not enough WME or NME teachers who rated their principals socially distant to allow the comparisons to be made in these groups.

The second positive relationship between low principal's social distance and a professional variable involved future career commitment. The teachers who described their principals as less distant were more likely than other teachers to want lifelong teaching careers. Here again, the teachers who said that the principal often associated informally with them did not differ from those who said that he did so from time to time, but both of these groups were more likely than those who said that he rarely or never associated with them to want lifelong careers. This relationship could not be checked in the WME or NME subcategories because of small N's. It was upheld in all four categories of women and among NMS teachers, but not among WMS.

The data on bureaucratic submission indicate the opposite kind of situation, with socially distant principals having the most professional (least submissive) teachers. Closeness to the principal apparently made teachers willing to submit to discipline. The control comparison we made in this instance consisted of seeing whether teachers with highly distant principals were less submissive than those whose principals were very low in distance. This was the case in all six subcategories where N's were large enough to allow the comparison, although the teachers who ranked their principals medium in distance were not always the middle category in bureaucratic submission, leading once and trailing once.

Table V-4 shows that the principal's authoritarianism index, which was strongly related to job satisfaction, was not related to any of the seven aspects of professionalism under consideration.

From Table V-5 it would appear that the principal's normative compliance was related to four of the seven professional variables. The apparent relationship of normative compliance to teachers'

TABLE V-4. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO SEVEN VARIABLES, BY PRINCIPAL'S AUTHORITARIANISM INDEX (VARIABLE 42)

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Democratic Principals (42: 3,4)		Authoritarian Principals (42: 0,1,2)	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	63	(3161)	62	(6172)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	17	(3036)	20	(5929)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	27	(2881)	27	(5682)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	40	(3048)	40	(5978)
Wanted lifelong teaching careers (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	49	(2703)	46	(5109)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	34	(3162)	34	(6165)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	44	(2922)	45	(5617)

TABLE V-5. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL ACCORDING TO SEVEN VARIABLES, BY PRINCIPAL'S NORMATIVE COMPLIANCE INDEX (VARIABLE 45)

Variables, Variable Numbers, and Designated Responses or Scores	Normative Compliance Index: Good (2) %	(N)	Medium (1) %	(N)	Bad (0) %	(N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2)	63	(4326)	63	(2473)	58	(2422)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)	49	(4138)	55	(2381)	60	(2333)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4)	25	(3909)	27	(2282)	30	(2254)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	40	(4151)	40	(2395)	41	(2367)
Wanted lifelong teaching careers (126: 1 as % of 1-5)	51	(3592)	47	(2064)	41	(2067)
High reading index (15: 3,4)	35	(4332)	33	(2467)	34	(2414)
Spent five or more days a year at professional meetings (165)	44	(3944)	45	(2264)	46	(2221)

reference group orientations was not sustained, however, when the race-sex-level control categories were examined separately; it was rather strong among WFE, WFS, and NFE teachers but was not evident in the other five categories. The figures for the total sample indicate no relationship of principal's normative compliance to teachers' holistic service emphasis index, reading index, or attendance at professional meetings.

Of the three relationships found in the total sample which held up well when race, sex, and level were controlled, two involved positive associations of normative compliance to elements of professionalism. Teachers who rated their principals high or medium in normative compliance were more likely than those who rated them low to favor professional self-improvement, in the total sample and in six of eight control categories, the exceptions being WME and NMS. Teachers who rated their principals low in normative compliance were the least committed to lifelong teaching careers, in six control categories but not among the NME; there were too few WME's in the low normative compliance category to allow the comparison to be made in this group.

The third relationship shown in Table V-5 which held up under controls, existing in all categories except NMS, indicated a negative relationship of principal's normative compliance to a professional variable, absence of bureaucratic submission. This finding is similar to that in a previous table, which showed the least socially distant principals having the most submissive teachers. It appears that teachers who felt socially close to their principals, and who thought that they could count on the principals to back them up and to be firm disciplinarians, were the most willing to submit to bureaucratic control.

To summarize all these findings, teachers who described their role-set relations in ways which suggested that they provided opportunities for sociability and protection against difficulties tended to be the most satisfied with their jobs, but in very few ways were they more professional than other teachers. Working conditions which pleased them did not professionalize them, a finding which is consistent with the evidence in Chapter III that the most satisfied teachers were in general no more professional than the least satisfied were. Four of the five role-set relationships looked at in this chapter, the exception being participation in local associations, were related to job satisfaction in ways which suggest that the teachers were interested in having friendly and protective job situations, and especially in having good relations with the principal; but few associations of these same role-set relations with professionalism were turned up.

CHAPTER VI

WHY ARE TEACHERS NOT MORE PROFESSIONAL?

The thesis of this chapter is that a principal reason why teachers are not more professional is that most of them are women.[1] Most women are more oriented to family roles than to work roles. The majority of them do not work continuously after completing their education, but stop working when they marry and have children. At any given time a large proportion of women teachers expect to stop working soon, or wish that they could. Even those who work continuously or return after their children have grown up must usually subordinate their careers to the demands of their families. Their household duties are likely to be more time-consuming than those of men. If their husbands' careers demand that they move to a new community, they must move.

More fundamentally, the values of American society define work as a man's world. Most people feel that if a woman's place is not literally in the home, at least her primary responsibilities lie there. For these reasons, women are not encouraged to view their careers as men are. Society expects a man to establish his social identity primarily through his work career. It does not expect this of a woman. Men are under social pressure to "succeed;" women are not. There are even subtle pressures on women not to succeed, if success means competing vigorously against men.

Any organization staffed mainly by women will develop an atmosphere, a set of expectations and understandings, which is profoundly influenced by the prevailing orientations of women. If women are not deeply committed to career advancement, do not regard the cultivation and application of specialized professional knowledge as their major goal, and do not strive for professional autonomy or for self-regulation by groups of colleagues, the organization will take account of these facts. It will not establish a pattern of employee autonomy, but will operate like a bureaucracy, emphasizing hierarchical authority and rules. This will happen especially if the heads of organizational units are, as most school principals are, men, in a society where women are expected to defer to men when major decisions are made. A school principal is not expected to be the leader of a group of equals. He is expected to be the boss. Both he and his teachers are subject to an elaborate set of requirements imposed by law, by state and federal supervision, and by the local school board. In essential matters of curriculum and the like, not much is left to the principal's discretion, and still less is left to the teacher's discretion.

---

[1] This thesis is argued, not only for teachers, but also for the other feminine semi-professions of nursing, social work, and librarianship, in Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, "Women and Bureaucracy in the Semi-Professions," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, New York: Free Press, 1969, pp. 196-265. The present report goes into more detail on some points and less on others than the book chapter, which relies mainly on secondary sources for data. The book chapter documents some of the sweeping generalizations in the next few paragraphs.

Society expects all this, women teachers seem to expect it, and men teachers expect it or adapt to it. Teaching tends to appeal to a certain kind of men in the first place. The men who choose to be school teachers are not notable for their thirst for knowledge or their drive for independence or power. Even those men (and women) who have such scholarly and aggressive motives to start with find themselves in a milieu where these are not the customary or expected orientations. It is not surprising if they end by behaving like the rest. The anthropologists have a word for such behavioral expectations and adaptations: culture. The culture of the school is not a professional one. It is a bureaucratic one, in which holistic service rather than the application of specialized professional knowledge is the chief positive incentive.

It is not possible to prove conclusively that the predominance of women in teaching is a factor in bringing about these conditions, for to do so would require comparative research on another occupation which resembled public school teaching very closely in all respects except its sex composition, and no such occupation exists. It is not claimed that the occupation's sex composition is the only reason why it is not more professional, or even that it is the main reason. Even if all teachers were men, the occupation would still lack the specialized knowledge base which is the main ingredient in the professionalism of occupations like law and medicine. It is possible, however, to muster evidence which strongly suggests that the sex composition of teachers has a lot to do with their lack of professionalism, and this is what we propose to do in this chapter.

Future Career Commitment and Professionalism

In Chapter IV (Table IV-5) it was shown that fewer than half the teachers in our sample wanted lifelong careers in the classroom. Table VI-1 gives data on what the others wanted, and indicates that there was considerably less commitment to teaching careers among younger teachers than among older ones.

More than a third of the men wanted to become administrators, more than a fifth of the men wanted to leave the field of education entirely, and both of these figures were higher among young teachers than among those over 40. The age differences presumably reflect the fact that many teachers who wanted to stop teaching had done so by the age of 40, and the differences would be much more marked if the table showed separate figures for teachers still in their 20's. The exodus of men from the

TABLE VI-1. FUTURE CAREER COMMITMENT OF TEACHERS BY SEX, AMONG ALL TEACHERS AND AMONG YOUNG AND OLD SEPARATELY

Categories of Respondents	Wanted Life-long Teaching Careers %	Wanted to Become Administrators %	Wanted To Be Full-Time Housewives %	Wanted Work Outside Field of Education %
Men (N=1582)*	43	35	--	21
Women (N=6087)*	48	5	40	7
Men 39 and younger (N=1189)*	37	39	--	23
Women 39 and younger (N=3240)*	36	5	50	9
Men 40 and older (N=393)*	61	24	--	15
Women 40 and older (N=2847)*	63	4	29	4

* N's exclude respondents who said that the question did not apply to them because they were nearing retirement age.

classroom can be seen by comparing the numbers of respondents in the two age categories. Men constituted about a fourth of the teachers under 40, but less than an eighth of those over 40. Negro and white men, not shown separately in the table, were rather similar in their degree and type of career commitment, except that Negroes were more likely to want to leave education entirely and less likely to want to stay in the classroom than whites were.

In contrast to men, only about one woman in twenty had administrative aspirations. Women were also much less likely than men to want jobs outside the field of education. But fully half the women under 40 wanted to stop teaching and become full-time housewives. The percentage of would-be housewives was higher than this among the youngest women, and was twice as high among white women as among Negro women, as has been reported earlier. More than 10% of the Negro women--young and old, elementary and secondary alike--wanted to be administrators, but only 3% of the white women did. When the teachers are classified by the variables used in Table VI-1, the two largest groups of them are young women who wanted to stop working, and older women who wanted to stay in the classroom; many of the latter group had stopped for awhile and returned after their children had grown up. From data shown in Table VI-1 and from data on the aspirations of college students reported in an earlier chapter, it can be inferred that the highest percentage of lifelong classroom teachers is to be found among Negro women, and the lowest among white women, with men of both races intermediate.

Our findings on the prevalence of discontinuous and temporary careers of teachers are consistent with other research on the subject. Mason has reported that in a national sample of public school teachers in 1956, 80% of the men but only 25% of the women expected to work continuously as teachers or school administrators until retirement; 58% of the women he studied planned to leave the labor force temporarily during the early years of family life and return later. Even the male figure of 80% expecting lifetime educational careers is not impressively high when we imagine what the percentage would probably be in a sample of beginning physicians or dentists. Studies by Corwin and Charters show that many people who are trained to teach do little or no teaching. Corwin reports that "one-third of the people trained to teach never enter teaching, and three out of five trained teachers are not in the profession at any one time."[3] Charters' study of education graduates of the University

---

[2] Ward S. Mason, The Beginning Teacher: Status and Career Aspirations, OE 23009, Circular No. 644, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 103.

[3] Ronald G. Corwin, A Sociology of Education, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965, pp. 5-6.

of Illinois found that 40% of them did not teach at all over a ten-year period, half of those who started teaching dropped out within two years, and 12% of the graduates produced 50% of the man-years of teaching done by these graduates.[4]

Table VI-I shows some deleterious effects on professionalism of the presence of so many women whose ambition it was to stop teaching. Teachers in the other commitment categories did not differ very much in their professionalism. Within career commitment categories, men and women did not differ greatly. Men had more colleague reference group orientation, women were more likely to favor extensive educational requirements for teachers, and there were other sex differences which appeared in some but not all categories of career commitment. But except for the two just noted, the sex differences shown in this table were largely a function of race differences and did not hold up with race controlled; Negro women were much more likely than white women to want to be administrators, and somewhat more likely to want to leave education entirely, and some sex differences in these categories are accounted for by the heavy concentration of Negro women in them. Men in different career commitment categories were substantially alike; even those who wanted to leave the field of education were much the same as the others except in the two knowledge orientation variables. The two apparent differences between women who wanted to become administrators and those who wanted to stay in teaching did not hold up with race controlled.

This leaves one set of differences which remained consistent with race controlled. The aspiring housewives were less professional in several respects than other women teachers were. They were less likely to favor professional self-improvement or educational requirements of teachers, and much lower on the two professional behavior items, the reading index and attendance at professional meetings. In short, they worked less hard at being teachers than others, male and female, did. This is to be expected in a group not committed to careers in the field, and especially in a group beset with competing time pressures from their families, for a large proportion of the would-be housewives were young women with children. We shall return later and in more detail to the subject of time pressures on young women teachers. The effects were obviously strong, for these women worked much less hard at their jobs than any others, even those who wanted jobs completely outside the field of education.

The figures show aspiring housewives more professional than other women in reference group orientation and in absence of holistic orientations, but neither of these differences persisted with race controlled. They were reversed or shrank below 5% among white and Negro women separately.

---

[4] W. W. Charters, Jr., "Survival in the Teaching Profession: A Criterion for Selecting Teacher Trainees," Journal of Teacher Education, 7 (1953), p. 253.

TABLE VI-2. PROFESSIONALISM OF MEN AND WOMEN TEACHERS ACCORDING TO SEVEN VARIABLES, BY FUTURE CAREER COMMITMENT

Variables and Responses or Scores of Men and Women	Wanted Life-long Teaching Careers		Wanted To Become Administrators		Wanted To Be Full-Time Housewives		Wanted Work Outside Field of Education	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Favored professional self-improvement (18: 1,2):								
Men	66	(674)	62	(556)	--	--	58	(331)
Women	68	(2883)	65	(292)	54	(2405)	61	(402)
Strongly favored education required of teachers (19: 5):								
Men	45	(674)	50	(556)	--	--	36	(330)
Women	51	(2875)	60	(288)	39	(2395)	48	(398)
Low bureaucratic submission index (25: 0,1)								
Men	52	(665)	52	(548)	--	--	55	(325)
Women	51	(2743)	52	(278)	55	(2319)	60	(388)
Colleague reference group (33: 3,4):								
Men	33	(619)	36	(522)	--	--	31	(307)
Women	25	(2569)	24	(266)	30	(2245)	21	(363)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2):								
Men	40	(662)	45	(547)	--	--	43	(330)
Women	37	(2769)	40	(275)	44	(2346)	41	(389)
High reading index (15: 3,4)								
Men	38	(678)	40	(556)	--	--	35	(334)
Women	41	(2879)	47	(287)	24	(2409)	37	(400)
Spent five or more days a year attending professional meetings (165):								
Men	47	(641)	49	(538)	--	--	48	(320)
Women	46	(2605)	57	(277)	37	(2214)	53	(368)

Thus the aspiring housewives were less interested in the specialized knowledge of education than other teachers were, they did not work very hard at their jobs--though most of them were probably very busy women, tending families--and they were not more professional than other teachers in any way. They constituted about a fourth of all the teachers in our sample, and about half of the people entering the occupation after college or preparing for it in college. A closer inspection of the data than seems necessary here would show that in many schools, they were the majority of teachers. Their presence is bound to have had an effect on the folkways of the occupation as a whole, including the expectations which administrators and school boards had of teachers and the ways in which they dealt with teachers.

Sex Stereotypes of Teaching

Many forces conspire to keep men out of teaching. The pay is lower than can be earned in occupations which require comparable amounts of education, and this especially true of the top salaries which can be earned in the prime of life. The prestige of the work is not necessarily high, especially at the elementary levels and in slum or rural schools, partly because the prestige of any work involving client service is affected by the prestige of the clients, and little children and slum and country adolescents do not have high prestige. (It is more prestigeful to teach graduate students than college undergraduates, undergraduates than high school students, and so on down to nursery school teaching, which in the public mind is seen as little more than baby-sitting. Similarly, Harley Street physicians outrank physicians with lower-class patients, and lawyers win prestige if they can attract rich clients. The rule in these latter cases seems to be that the more desperately the patient or client needs the services, the less prestigeful it is to serve him.)

In addition to these utilitarian considerations of money and prestige, cultural values are at work to keep men out of teaching. Teaching is defined as women's work. This very fact helps to account, in turn, for the low salaries and the low prestige of teaching. The public feels, quite correctly, that it can recruit women more cheaply than it could recruit the same number of men, and many people continue to feel that women ought not to be paid as much as men because they are less likely to have big families to support. Paradoxically, the same people tend to feel that outright sex discrimination in pay for the same work would be unjust, so the possibility of pay differentials to get more men into the occupation is not considered--nor need it be considered in order to obtain enough teachers, for enough women, or almost enough, are available at the existing pay rates. The very fact that most teachers are women probably helps to explain the low prestige of the occupation in comparison with other occupations requiring equivalent training. Rossi has noted that the only country in which opinion polls have not put medical doctors at the top of the occupational prestige ladder is the Soviet

Union, where a large proportion of doctors are women.[5] Men who become teachers must brave public opinion, which tells them that they are entering an occupation more suitable for women, and which may wonder how an aggressive he-man could go into a career offering low pay, low prestige, and not very virile activities.

We are not evaluating the justice or accuracy of these beliefs, but merely pointing to their existence and suggesting that they have effects. One effect is to deter men who might enjoy teaching from taking it up. Another is to over-select, among the men who do enter the field, men with below-average academic abilities and achievements, and men with "feminine" interests such as the desire to give humanitarian service.[6] Still another, which we shall document below, is to concentrate men mainly in some teaching fields which are regarded as more masculine than others. The avoidance by men of teaching fields defined by public opinion as more appropriate for women cannot be the result of the generally low prestige of teaching or of low salaries, for these are much the same regardless of what one teaches. The explanation has to lie in cultural stereotypes of different teaching fields as more suitably male or female.

Our data indicate that many of the teachers themselves share the prevailing stereotypes of teaching as a feminine occupation, and of different subjects as more appropriately taught by members of one or the other sex. Even male teachers, who have come into the occupation despite the stereotype of it as a woman's field, apparently have these opinions. In our sample, 82% of the men and 85% of the women said that they would advise a daughter of theirs to become a teacher, but only 61% of the men and 47% of the women said that they would advise a son to be a teacher. (N's = 1711, 7427, 1702, 7406).

The feminine stereotype of teaching applies especially to teaching in the elementary grades, as is seen in Table VI-3. When respondents were asked whether they thought that "most teachers would have more respect for" a man who teaches the fifth grade or a woman who teaches the fifth grade, 46% felt that the woman would be given more respect, and only 8% felt that the man would be given more respect. Fewer than half felt that colleagues would have the same respect for the man as for the woman. Even the men thought that colleagues would respect the

---

[5] Peter H. Rossi, "Discussion," in Philip H. Ennis and Howard W. Winger (eds.), Seven Questions about the Profession of Librarianship, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, p. 83.

[6] Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957; James A. Davis, Great Aspirations, Chicago: Aldine, 1964; James A. Davis, Undergraduate Career Decisions, Chicago: Aldine, 1965. Literature surveyed in Simpson and Simpson, op. cit., shows similar patterns of male recruitment into other predominantly feminine semi-professions.

TABLE VI-3. AMOUNT OF RESPECT ATTRIBUTED BY TEACHERS TO MALE AND FEMALE FIFTH GRADE TEACHER, HIGH SCHOOL ALGEBRA TEACHER, AND ASPIRING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Variables and Categories of Respondents	More for Man %	More for Woman %	Same for Both %
Respect of most teachers for fifth grade teacher:			
Male respondents (N=1756)	21	43	37
Female respondents (N=7548)	5	47	48
All respondents (N=9304)	8	46	46
Respect of general public for fifth grade teacher:			
Male respondents (N=1763)	15	58	27
Female respondents (N=7534)	6	60	34
All respondents (N=9297)	7	60	33
Respect of most teachers for high school algebra teacher:			
Male respondents (N=1736)	57	2	41
Female respondents (N=7449)	29	5	67
All respondents (N=9185)	34	4	62
Respect of general public for high school algebra teacher:			
Male respondents (N=1734)	62	4	35
Female respondents (N=7444)	40	6	55
All respondents (N=9178)	43	6	51
Respect of most teachers for teacher ambitious to be elementary school principal:			
Male respondents (N=1758)	70	4	25
Female respondents (N=7512)	49	7	44
All respondents (N=9270)	53	6	41
Respect of general public for teacher ambitious to be elementary school principal:			
Male respondents (N=1758)	74	4	21
Female respondents (N=7532)	59	7	34
All respondents (N=9290)	62	6	32

woman more, though men were much more likely than women to see the man as receiving more respect. The only race-sex-level category in which women fifth grade teachers were not given the edge over men was NME teachers, who were equally likely to feel that the man and the woman would be more respected. Presumably the stereotype of elementary teaching as a feminine pursuit would have been still greater if the question had asked about teaching in the lowest primary grades, and we would hazard the guess that many teachers would regard the idea of men teaching kindergarten or nursery school as absurd.

In contrast, teachers of both sexes were more likely to think that their colleagues would have more respect for a man than for a woman, if both taught high school algebra. In this instance, however, two-thirds of the women felt that most teachers would accord the same respect to both.

Perhaps the most noteworthy indication of the stereotyping of sex roles was that teachers of both sexes attributed far more respect to the man than to the woman who aspired to be an elementary school principal, though they favored the woman as a teacher at this level. More than two-thirds of the male respondents felt that the man would be preferred as an elementary school principal, and nearly half the women agreed with them, though almost as many women felt that the sex of the aspiring elementary school principal would make no difference as felt that the man would be given more respect.

Teachers attributed the same kinds of sex stereotypes to the general public as to other teachers, and more of them attributed stereotyped views to the public than to their colleagues. The questions were whether "the general public would have more respect for" the male or female fifth grade teacher, high school algebra teacher, and aspiring elementary school principal.

This table and some of the succeeding ones do not show separate figures for Negro and white respondents or for elementary and secondary teachers. In all instances except those specifically mentioned, the general patterns were the same in all race-sex-level categories, although they were not equally strong in all categories. One almost completely consistent finding, not shown in the tables, was that Negroes held less stereotyped views than whites did. Negroes were more accepting than whites of male elementary teachers, female high school algebra teachers, and women who wanted to be principals; and it may be recalled that Negro women were much more likely than white women to have administrative aspirations. These facts should provide food for thought for anyone who assumes that irrational stereotypes are always most widespread among people from unsophisticated backgrounds, since a far higher proportion of Negroes than of whites had grown up in blue-collar, relatively uneducated families. Perhaps the Negroes were tolerant of male elementary teachers because teaching has been one of the few middle-class occupations fully open to Negro men, especially in the South with its sheltered Negro labor market in segregated schools and its dearth of other middle-class opportunities for Negroes. They may have been less resistant than whites to the notion of a woman principal because of the matriarchal character of many Negro families which sociologists have often remarked.

Table VI-4 shows what may be some effects of the stereotype of teaching as a feminine occupation. The women were more satisfied with teaching as a career than the men were, and the women were also more satisfied with two aspects of role-set relations which would seem likely to involve their perceptions of how others felt about them, the attitudes of their pupils' parents and the respect they felt that their communities had for teachers. In Chapter IV it was shown that the sexes did not differ in most aspects of work satisfaction.

The fact that the algebra teacher was felt to be more respected if male than if female suggests that the sex stereotypes of teaching are differentiated, not simply a matter of teaching's being considered a feminine occupation. Tables VI-5 through VI-7 show that in secondary school teaching, our respondents considered some subjects more suitable for one or the other sex to teach, and thought that a teacher would be accorded more prestige by colleagues and the public if he or she taught a sexually appropriate subject.

Table VI-5 gives the percentages of teachers who said that different secondary school subjects were "more appropriate for a man" and "more appropriate for a woman." (The percentage who said of each subject that the sex of the teacher "makes no difference" can be obtained by adding the two percentages shown and subtracting the total from 100%.) The table also shows ranks of the subjects in the percentages of respondents who said that they would be more appropriate for men and for women. (The ranks shown for science and mathematics as subjects for women to teach are accurate, since the figure of 1% shown for each is rounded from 1.1% for mathematics and 0.6% for science.)

It is evident in Table VI-5 that clear-cut views of the sex appropriateness of different teaching fields existed among these teachers and it is significant that the question asked for their own opinions, not for their guesses about what other teachers or the general public might feel. More than half assigned a sex preference to science teaching, and more than a third assigned one to three of the other four fields. Science and mathematics were clearly seen as masculine fields, and English and foreign languages as subjects more appropriately taught by women. Only social studies had a sexually neutral image. Four-fifths of the respondents said that the sex of a social studies teacher made no difference, and among those who did assign a sex preference to this subject, there was less agreement as to the proper sex of the teacher than was found regarding the other four subjects. Social studies

TABLE VI-4. TEACHERS' CAREER SATISFACTION AND PERCEIVED ATTITUDE OF PARENTS AND COMMUNITY, BY SEX

Variables and Designated Responses	Men % (N)	Women % (N)
Said that teaching was the most satisfying career they could realistically imagine (38: 1)	24 (1728)	37 (7462)
Rated parents' attitude outstanding or above average (73: 1,2)	27 (1742)	36 (7459)
Rated respect of people in the community for teachers outstanding or above average (74: 1,2)	34 (1742)	40 (7476)

TABLE VI-5. TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SEX APPROPRIATENESS OF HIGH SCHOOL SUBJECTS

Subject and Number of Respondents	More Appropriate for a Man		More Appropriate for a Woman		% "Man" Minus % "Woman"
	%	Rank	%	Rank	
Science (N=9144)	53	1	1	5	+52
Mathematics (N=9146)	43	2	1	4	+42
Social studies (N=9179)	13	3	7	3	+6
Foreign language (N=9140)	2	4	31	2	-29
English (N=9150)	1	5	46	1	-45

was seen as masculine by 13% of the respondents and as feminine by 7%; in no other instance did more than 2% of the respondents assign the "wrong" sex stereotype to a subject. The ranking of subjects from most masculine (science) to most feminine (English) was duplicated in all eight race-sex-level categories of respondents.[7]

Tables VI-6 and VI-7 suggest that the perceived prestige of a secondary school teacher, with colleagues and the general public, was strongly influenced but not wholly determined by the subject which he or she taught. These two tables show a number of things, and we shall examine them in some detail.

The ranking of differences between the prestige attributed to a man and a woman teacher, with both colleagues and the general public, precisely parallelled the perceived masculinity or femininity of the subjects they taught. Thus the prestige differentials favored male science and mathematics teachers, especially science, which rated highest in masculinity according to the "appropriateness" questions reported in Table VI-5; the prestige differentials favored female English teachers, and, to a lesser extent, female foreign language teachers, English and languages being the feminine fields; and there was hardly any difference between the perceived prestige of men and women who taught the sexually neutral subject of social studies.

Ignoring social studies for the moment, the more masculine a subject was according to the appropriateness question, the higher was the perceived colleague and public prestige of a man teaching the subject, and the lower the perceived colleague and public prestige of a woman teaching it. At the extremes, 73% thought that a male science teacher would have high prestige among his colleagues (Table VI-6) and 81% thought that he would have high prestige among the general public (Table VI-7), while the corresponding figures for a male teacher of English, a feminine subject, were only 34% and 24%. The opposite rankings were given to the perceived prestige of women teaching the same

---

[7] There was one trivial reversal of a difference among NFS respondents, of whom 1.1% (four teachers) said that science was more appropriate for a woman and 0.5% (two teachers) said that mathematics was more appropriate for a woman. But the NFS, like everyone else, were substantially more likely to say that science was more appropriate for a man than to say this about mathematics, so that the NFS teachers were not an exception to the rule that all categories of respondents ranked the fields in the order shown in the table as measured by the figures shown in the right-hand column, which shows the differences between the percentages saying they were more appropriate for a man and more appropriate for a woman.

TABLE VI-6. TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF MAN'S AND WOMAN'S PRESTIGE AMONG OTHER TEACHERS, IF THEY TAUGHT DIFFERENT SUBJECTS

	Man		Woman		
Subject Taught	% High	Rank	% High	Rank	Man's % High Minus Woman's % High
Science	73	1	47	4	+26
Mathematics	72	2	51	3	+21
Social Studies	34	4	33	5	+1
Foreign language	36	3	60	2	-24
English	34	5	68	1	-34

N's vary from 8869 to 8900 for men and women teaching different subjects.

TABLE VI-7. TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF MAN'S AND WOMAN'S PRESTIGE WITH GENERAL PUBLIC, IF THEY TAUGHT DIFFERENT SUBJECTS

Subject Taught	Man		Woman		Man's % High Minus Woman's % High
	% High	Rank	% High	Rank	
Science	81	1	40	4	+41
Mathematics	78	2	45	3	+33
Social studies	32	3	30	5	+2
Foreign language	28	4	62	2	-34
English	24	5	74	1	-50

N's vary from 8911 to 8957 for men and women teaching different subjects.

subjects, still omitting social studies from consideration. Female teachers were thought to have the most prestige if they taught English, and the least if they taught science.

As was the case with the questions about the respect accorded to the fifth grade teacher, the algebra teacher, and the aspiring principal, these questions about prestige revealed that teachers attributed more stereotyped views to the general public than to other teachers. They attributed higher public than colleague prestige to teachers in sexually appropriate fields, but higher colleague than public prestige to teachers in sexually inappropriate fields. Thus the differences between the percentages who said that men, and women, teaching different subjects would have high prestige--the figures shown in the right-hand columns of the two tables-- ranged from 41% in favor of male science teachers to 50% in favor of female English teachers in perceived public attitudes, but only from 26% in favor of male science teachers to 34% in favor of female English teachers in perceived colleague attitudes.

Social studies ranked lower in perceived prestige among both colleagues and the general public than would be predicted from its sex appropriateness ratings, regardless of whether a man or a woman taught it. It ranked a distant last in perceived colleague and public prestige for women teachers, although it ranked third in femininity, and it rated almost as low as foreign languages and English in perceived prestige for male teachers, although it was seen as considerably more masculine than these subjects. Social studies seems to be a low-prestige field regardless of who teaches it. One may surmise that its low standing reflects a widespread feeling that it is short on intellectual content, and that this feeling is directed at the nonhistorical subjects such as sociology, geography, problems of democracy, and civics which fall under the social studies rubric. History, one would think, would merit a higher rating if solid intellectual content is indeed the criterion being employed; but the hash of blandly treated social problems, conventional family mores, and the like which have often gone under the name of sociology or problems of democracy in high school courses may have brought the field the low repute it appears to have among teachers. The situation is not, one may speculate, helped by the fact that the courses which lead to certification in social studies are mainly in history, but the certified products of the training programs are then sent out to teach subjects other than history. From the standpoint of our present research, however, the fact that the low prestige of social studies disturbs the correlation between sex appropriateness and prestige strengthens one's confidence in the findings on the other four subjects, by demonstrating that the respondents were evaluating different things when they answered the questions about prestige and sex appropriateness. This means that we have found empirical relationships, not mere tautologies.

The sex appropriateness of the subjects they taught affected the prestige of men more than that of women. Concerning colleague prestige, the difference between the percentages of respondents who assigned high prestige to male science and English teachers was 39% (73% minus 34%), but the difference between the percentages assigning high colleague prestige to female English and science teachers was only 21% (68% minus 47%). Corresponding differences in perceived public prestige were 57% between male science and English teachers but only 34% between female English and science teachers. The men were given higher prestige ratings than the women when both were in sexually appropriate fields, but lower ratings than the women when both were in sexually inappropriate fields. It is possible that these differences reflect two tendencies, to assign higher prestige to men in general, but to take a dimmer view of a man in a woman's role than of a woman in a man's role.

Figures not shown in the tables indicate that with a few very small reversals, the eight subcategories of teachers classified by race, sex, and level were in agreement in their prestige orderings of men and women in different fields. The only exceptions involved a tendency of white and Negro male elementary teachers to see slightly more sex difference in the prestige of mathematics than of science teachers, and several small reversals in the prestige order of men in the three least masculine fields. All categories of respondents rated male language teachers higher than male English teachers, but the prestige rank of male social studies teachers, especially the rank of their prestige among colleagues, ranged inconsistently from third to fifth. But men teaching science and mathematics were sharply distinguished from men in other fields by all categories of respondents, and the rankings of female teachers' prestige among both colleagues and the public were completely consistent in all eight categories of respondents, except for a single reversal of the position of women mathematics and science teachers involving a difference of one-tenth of a percent.

Sex stereotypes and work satisfaction. Being in an occupation widely considered to be more appropriate for a member of the opposite sex would seem likely to reduce work satisfaction, especially when one's own fellow workers share the sex stereotype and feel that low prestige attaches to men or women, as the case may be, who are in it. This reasoning is supported by some findings reported earlier, that career satisfaction and perceptions of favorable parental attitudes and community respect for teachers more prevalent among women teachers than among men teachers. To explore the relation of sex stereotyping to work satisfaction further, three hypotheses were tested. The first received little support but the remaining two were supported by the data.

The first hypothesis was that teachers adversely stereotyped would derive less satisfaction from teaching, and would have less career commitment to classroom teaching, than those not adversely stereotyped. The greater over-all satisfaction of women than of men lends some support to this hypothesis, but other predictions derived from it turned out to be false. We will save ink by not presenting the tabulations on the other predictions; some of them indicated no differences between categories, and others indicated irregular patterns which could not be interpreted as firmly supporting the hypothesis. The predictions which failed were: (a) Men are less likely than women to say that "being thought of in the community as a teacher" is among the good aspects of teaching. (b) The greater the sex appropriateness of the teaching role, the greater is the career commitment to teaching. This expectation was borne out in comparing male elementary vs. secondary teachers, but not among women or among men who taught different secondary school subjects. (c) The greater the sex appropriateness of the teaching role, the greater is the career satisfaction. (d) The greater the sex appropriateness of the teaching role, the more probable it is that a teacher will mention "being thought of in the community as a teacher" as a good aspect of teaching. (e) The greater the sex appropriateness of the teaching role, the greater is the likelihood of advising a child of one's own sex to become a teacher.

The failure of these predictions indicates that in general, sex stereotyping did not result in dissatisfaction among teachers in inappropriate fields. The next two hypotheses were aimed at discovering how the teachers in sexually inappropriate fields avoided being dissatisfied. Both hypotheses were supported, and they suggest that adversely stereotyped teachers adjust to the situation by denying the existence of the stereotype which other teachers affirm. The tables on these hypotheses give data on teachers of secondary school subjects generally deemed inappropriate for their sexes. Only whites are included in these tabulations. To have mixed white and Negro teachers together would have introduced extraneous variation due to race, and there were too few Negroes in some of the categories to examine them separately.

The second of our three hypotheses about stereotypes and satisfaction was that teachers of subjects generally considered inappropriate for their sexes would tend to deny the stereotype. Table VI-8 reports data which, when contrasted to the findings shown in the three previous tables, support this hypothesis. Teachers of sexually inappropriate subjects were much less likely than teachers in general to say that their subjects were more appropriate for the other sex, and they attributed more colleague and public prestige to members of their own sex who taught their subjects than other teachers did.

The third hypothesis was that among teachers of subjects generally regarded as inappropriate for members of their sex, those who denied the stereotype would be more satisfied with teaching as a career than would those who agreed with the prevailing stereotype. Table VI-9 bears out this expectation among both male and female teachers of sexually inappropriate subjects, although the number of male accepters was small and the findings about the men must therefore be viewed with caution. Among the men, acceptance vs. denial of the stereotype made a difference of 10% in

TABLE VI-8. PERCENTAGES OF WHITE MALE AND FEMALE SECONDARY TEACHERS OF SEXUALLY INAPPROPRIATE SUBJECTS WHO AGREED THAT THEIR SUBJECTS WERE MORE APPROPRIATE FOR THE OTHER SEX, AND WHO ATTRIBUTED HIGH PRESTIGE AMONG OTHER TEACHERS AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC TO PEOPLE OF THEIR SEXES TEACHING THEIR SUBJECTS

Category of Respondents	Subject More Appropriate for Other Sex		Prestige among Teachers High		Prestige with Public High	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Male English teachers	18	(105)	49	(104)	34	(104)
Male foreign language teachers	21	(24)	58	(24)	46	(24)
Female science teachers	14	(164)	56	(160)	56	(160)
Female mathematics teachers	14	(249)	59	(242)	62	(244)

TABLE VI-9. CAREER SATISFACTION OF WHITE MEN AND WOMEN SECONDARY TEACHERS OF SEXUALLY INAPPROPRIATE SUBJECTS, BY WHETHER THEY DENIED OR ACCEPTED THE SEX STEREOTYPES OF THEIR SUBJECTS

	Career Satisfaction		
Sex, Subject Taught, and Denial or Acceptance of Stereotype	Highly Satisfied (38: 1) %	Moderately Satisfied (38: 2) %	Not Satisfied (38: 3,4) %
Male English and language teachers who denied the stereotype (N=105)	31	55	14
Male English and language teachers who accepted the stereotype (N=24)	21	50	29
Female science and mathematics teachers who denied the stereotype (N=354)	31	50	19
Female science and mathematics teachers who accepted the stereotype (N=57)	16	53	32

the likelihood of being highly satisfied with teaching, and 15% in the likelihood of being dissatisfied. The corresponding figures for women, which can be accepted more confidently since the N's were larger, were a 15% difference in the probability of being highly satisfied and a 13% difference in the probability of being dissatisfied.

Thus the teachers of sexually inappropriate subjects were less likely than other teachers to agree that the subjects were inappropriate for them, and those who denied the stereotypes were somewhat more likely than those who accepted them to express satisfaction with teaching as a career. In this way the adverse effects of the stereotypes on the self-images of many of these teachers were blunted.

Sex stereotypes and teacher recruitment. An additional hypothesis about the effects of sex stereotypes was a very general one, that the stereotypes would be reflected in patterns of teachers recruitment. The next two tables test specific predictions derived from this general hypothesis, with generally confirmatory results.

Table VI-10 tests the prediction that the more masculine a subject was considered to be, the higher would be the percentage of its teachers who were men. The prediction was generally but not completely borne out. It was supported with complete consistency among Negroes, with the percentages of men rising from 11% of elementary teachers to 61% of science teachers. (The table lists the fields in order from least to most masculine in stereotype.) Among whites, the same pattern prevailed except that English and foreign languages, the two feminine fields, were tied in their percentages of men, and more men were teaching social studies than should have been according to the prediction.

The high number of male white social studies teachers, while it is contrary to the hypothesis and the prediction, has the virtue of indicating that the stereotype was not simply a reflection of the actual numbers of men in the different fields. This strengthens our argument, for if the stereotypes were no more than reflections of the actual proportions of men in the different teaching fields, we could hardly turn around and argue that the proportions were influenced by the stereotypes. We lack data which could show conclusively which way the cause and effect relation went between the sex stereotypes of the fields and the numbers of men and women who entered them. Probably it went both ways. But the data on the next prediction derived from our recruitment hypothesis, given in Table VI-11, provides some limited evidence that the stereotypes had effects on recruitment of teachers.

Table VI-11 tests the prediction that the masculine fields would have higher percentages of men from rural backgrounds than the feminine fields would have. Teachers with rural backgrounds were defined as those who had spent their childhoods in open country areas or in towns and villages inhabited by fewer than 2500 people. The reasoning behind this

TABLE VI-10. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS IN DIFFERENT FIELDS WHO WERE MALE, BY RACE

Subject Taught	Whites		Negroes	
	% Male	(N)	% Male	(N)
Elementary grades	6	(4325)	11	(1177)
English	16	(64	12	(101)
Foreign languages	16	(144)	27	(22)
Social studies	51	(319)	41	(70)
Mathematics	39	(410)	52	(79)
Science	51	(336)	61	(70)

TABLE VI-11. PERCENTAGES OF MALE TEACHERS IN DIFFERENT FIELDS WHO HAD GROWN UP IN RURAL COMMUNITIES, BY RACE

	White Men		Negro Men	
Subject Taught	% with Rural Origins	(N)	% with Rural Origins	(N)
Elementary grades	70	(249)	42	(132)
English and foreign languages	50	(129)	38	(16)
Social studies	54	(157)	29	(28)
Mathematics	63	(157)	39	(41)
Science	66	(169)	39	(41)

prediction was that traditional stereotypes tend to be held more strongly in rural areas than in urban places, a generalization amply attested to by many sociological studies and public opinion polls. Science and mathematics have a hard practicality about them which should make traditionally minded people regard them as suitably masculine, but the same cannot be said of humanities subjects like English and foreign languages.

Table VI-11 can be read as giving some support to the prediction or as rejecting it, depending upon what part of the table is read. No pattern at all is observed among Negro men, but the numbers of them were so small that it might have been wiser to ignore them, as was done in some of the earlier tabulations. With N's this small, changes by a very small number of individuals would have produced markedly different percentages. Among whites, the prediction fares poorly indeed in the comparison of elementary vs. secondary male teachers. Rural backgrounds were more prevalent among male elementary teachers than among male teachers of any secondary subject, a finding precisely opposite to what the prediction would lead us to expect. Among white male secondary teachers, however, a neat pattern is evident, and bears out the prediction with respect to these teachers. The percentages with rural origins rose steadily as the masculinity of the subjects rose, from 50% of male social studies teachers to 66% of male science teachers.

Not too much stock should be placed in these findings on community origins of male teachers, however, either in the findings which came out as expected or in those which did not. A variety of forces, sometimes mutually reinforcing and sometimes counteracting, operate in the occupational choices of rural men. For example, the sex stereotypes we have been discussing should presumably keep rural men out of teaching and, in particular, out of those teaching fields which are viewed as more appropriate for women. On the other hand, rural men are at a disadvantage in urban occupational competition and they are probably at a disadvantage in academic competition to get into good colleges and do well once in them, because their knowledge of available occupations is limited and the schools and general intellectual climates in rural areas are inferior to those in cities.[8] These disadvantages probably tend to push men into

---

[8] On the disadvantages suffered by men from rural areas in urban labor market competition, see Seymour Martin Lipset, "Social Mobility and Urbanization," Rural Sociology, 20 (1955), pp. 220-228; Saymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959, pp. 203-226; Richard L. Simpson, "Occupational Careers and Mobility," in F. Stuart Chapin, Jr. and Shirley F. Weiss (eds.), Urban Growth Dynamics, New York: Wiley, 1962, pp. 400-420; Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, The American Occupational Structure, New York: Wiley, 1967, pp. 277-294. These studies indicate that if one wishes to succeed in the occupational world, it is not a good idea to be born poor, black, southern, or rural, and that each of these disadvantages has separate effects so that their combined effects are cumulative for those so unfortunate as to suffer than one of them.

"soft" teaching fields not requiring rigorous intellectual preparation, such as elementary teaching and social studies; but they may also mean that rural men with mathematical or scientific interests are forced to apply them in school classrooms while urban men get the high-paying jobs in industry; and these tendencies would have counteracting effects on the proportions of teachers in different fields who are men.

In discussing the sex compositions of different teaching fields, it is conceivable that we may have been ignoring a factor whose effect would be to dampen some of the predicted relationships. Perhaps some of the people teaching sexually inappropriate subjects had not chosen to do so, but were newcomers who had been given whatever teaching assignments had to be filled in their schools. State certification procedures are supposed to keep this from happening, but there is reason to believe that it does happen with distressing frequency. Unfortunately we failed to obtain data on whether the teachers were teaching the subjects they had been trained to teach, or wanted to teach, so we cannot check out this possibility directly. We can do so indirectly, however, by comparing the age distribution of teachers in appropriate vs. inappropriate fields, and by comparing the percentages of them who were in their first teaching jobs, on the assumption that newcomers and elderly retreads would be the teachers most often required to teach outside their fields.

The data, which can be reported without giving a table, seem to rule out this possibility that teachers in sexually inappropriate fields were more likely than the others to have been drafted into fields they would have preferred not to be in. The age distributions and the percentages who were in their first jobs were essentially the same among teachers of appropriate and inappropriate subjects. For example, 12% of male science and mathematics teachers and 11% of male English and language teachers were under 25, and 2% of each of these groups were over 60; among women, 16% of science and mathematics teachers were under 25, and so were 16% of English and language teachers, while 4% of science and mathematics teachers and 5% of English and language teachers were over 60. In short, there were no meaningful age differences between teachers of sexually appropriate and inappropriate subjects. The findings with respect to percentages holding their first jobs were not greatly different, and in this respect the only meaningful difference was one in which the teachers of appropriate subjects were more, not less, likely to be newcomers. Among the men, 40% of science and mathematics teachers and 35% of English and language teachers were in their first jobs. The percentages of newcomers among women were 23% of science and mathematics teachers and 24% of English and language teachers. Thus it seems unlikely that a significant proportion of the respondents who were teaching inappropriate subjects were doing so involuntarily--or if many were, so were an equal proportion of those teaching in appropriate fields.

What Do Women Teachers Want?

Teaching is mainly a woman's occupation and is likely to remain so. Chapter III has documented extensively the fact that the teachers we studied were not very professional in outlook, motives, or behavior. Evidence presented in Chapter V indicates that their evaluation of a teaching position as good or bad hinged more on whether the role-set relationships of the job were friendly and protective than on the opportunities for professionalsim the job afforded. It was also shown in Chapter V that the features of a job which increased teachers' job satisfaction did not in most cases increase their professionalism. In these respects the women teachers were not greatly different from the men. Some important sex differences were, however, turned up, and in this section we shall look at some of the ways in which the occupation of teaching is rendered less professional than it might otherwise be by the prevalence of typically or predominantly feminine orientations.

The task is made difficult by the fact that men who choose to be teachers tend to resemble women in their interest patterns to start with,[9] and by the fact that the behavior and outlook of male teachers are no doubt affected by the feminine milieux in which they work; but a case can be made for the impact of women on the nature of the occupation. We shall argue the point partly from our own data, and partly from literature in teachers and other semi-professional workers whose work situations and orientations are similar to those of teachers.

The main topics to be discussed are (1) family vs. career orientations and lack of ambition, (2) women's compliant predispositions and deference to men, (3) desire for friendly work atmospheres, (4) holistic service orientations, and (5) lack of colleague reference group and collegial authority orientations.

Family vs. career orientations and lack of ambition. Work careers lack the psychological meaning for most women that they have for men. Society expects women to orient primarily to family roles, and most of them do. Women's self-images are built mainly around their family roles whereas men's are conditioned more by their occupational roles. A man who works 60 hours a week to succeed in his career is respected and admired for this, but a woman who does the same thing may be accused of neglecting her children or her husband.

It follows that women are generally less ambitious than men for occupational career success. Marriage and motherhood can bring them more social approval than successful work careers can. Therefore many women who work seek primarily "an agreeable job that makes few demands."[10] One indication of this among teachers is the small proportion of women who aspire to become principals. We have already observed that many women teachers consider such aspirations more appropriate for men than for women. Mason found that 51% of men in their first year of teaching hoped to become school administrators, but that only 9% of single women, 8% of married women, and 19% of widowed, separated, and divorced women had administrative aspirations when they started teaching. Mason's data show that even among beginning teachers who expected to work continuously in education until retirement, 64% of the men as contrasted to 43% of the single women, 31% of the married women, and 28% of the separated, divorced, and widowed women were ambitious to become administrators.[11] Table VI-12 shows that among the teachers we studied who were in their twenties, administrative aspirations among white women were even rarer than Mason found, though they were more common among Negro women.

---

[9] Rosenberg, op. cit., pp. 26-27, 46-47; Davis, Great Aspirations, op. cit., p. 173.

It might be argued that women's lack of ambition to become principals is a sign that they are more professional, not less so, than men, since a teacher who becomes a principal no longer applies the specialized skills of education, but becomes a generalist manager whose role is not grealy different from that of an executive in business or government. However, "success" in education is commonly viewed as promotion to an administrative position. This is much less the case, if at all, in fully professional occupations. A professor who becomes a dean, or a physician who becomes a hospital administrator, is more likely to be said by his colleagues to have left the field than to have been promoted; and the prestige and even the salary of an academic or hospital administrator may be less than those of the most eminent professors and doctors who continue to ply their professional skills. The people who are most thoroughly imbued with the norms of any occupation are apt to want success, as success is defined within the occupation. In the public schools, success means leaving the classroom, and men are far more likely to have this wish than women are. This suggests that women teachers are less committed to the career values of their occupation than men teachers are. Women teachers' lack of ambition probably reinforces both their willingness to submit to bureaucratic control and their greater interest in maintaining friendly relations with colleagues than in pursuing professional interests aggressively.

---

[10] Robert W. Smuts, Women and Work in America, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959, p. 108.

[11] Mason, op. cit., p. 103. The figures on those who planned lifelong careers in education are our calculations from Mason's data.

TABLE VI-12. FUTURE CAREER COMMITMENT OF WOMEN TEACHERS YOUNGER THAN THIRTY, BY RACE, MARITAL STATUS, AND HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION

Race, Marital Status, and Husband's Occupation	Future Career Commitment			
	Wanted to Remain Teachers	Wanted to Become Administrators	Wanted to Become Housewives	Wanted Jobs Outside Education
	%	%	%	%
White women, single, separated, divorced, or widowed (N = 513)	24	4	57	15
White women with husbands in white-collar occupations (N = 622)	22	3	70	4
White women with husbands in agricultural or blue-collar occupations (N = 187)	32	3	60	4
Negro women, single, separated, divorced, or widowed (N = 160)	32	14	22	32
Negro women with husbands in white-collar occupations (N = 84)	27	13	42	18
Negro women with husbands in agricultural or blue-collar occupations (N = 51)	45	12	24	20

Another result of the family role orientation of women, which has been discussed earlier, is the tendency for their teaching careers to be temporary or discontinuous. The absence of lifelong career commitments probably reduces the disposition of these women to go all out in pursuit of professional excellence during their short stays in the occupation. Not many of the women who return to teaching after years of absence have kept up with the literature of education or of the subjects they teach, and it seems unlikely that a few summer refresher courses can bring them fully up to date. From the organization standpoint of the schools, the constant turnover of personnel as young women leave and older ones come back probably has demoralizing effects on the teaching staffs, reduces colleague group solidarity, and increases the need for firm leadership from the top. We shall speculate at more length about the organizational effects of teacher turnover in the concluding section of this chapter.

If a woman marries, the higher is her husband's occupational status, the less likely it is that she will stay at work. Among women in the semi-professions, for example, the most continuous careers are found among nurses, the least continuous careers are those of social workers and librarians, and teachers are intermediate in career continuity. These differences correspond to the occupational distributions of the husbands of women in these fields. The husbands of teachers are, on the average, higher in status and income than the husbands of nurses, but lower than the husbands of librarians and social workers.[12] Our findings reported earlier, that lifelong career commitments were more prevalent among Negro than white teachers or college students, point to a similar pattern within the occupation of teaching, though the data on students suggest that desire as well as necessity was a factor in the greater career commitment of Negro women. (See Chapter III.)

---

[12] See the discussion in Simpson and Simpson, op. cit., pp. 212-214, 217-218, based on census data and on inferences from the following sources: Mason, op. cit., pp. 12-13, 109; William Wattenberg et al., "Social Origins of Teachers," in Lindley J. Stiles (ed.), The Teacher's Role in American Society, New York: Harper, 1957, pp. 13-16; National Education Association, The Status of the American Public-School Teacher, Washington: NEA, 1957, p. 9; Marvin Bressler and William M. Kephart, Career Dynamics, Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Nurses' Association, 1955, p. 116; Irwin Deutscher, "A Survey of the Social and Occupational Characteristics of a Metropolitan Nurse Complement," Kansas City, Mo.: Community Studies, Inc., 1956, cited in Everett C. Hughes, Helen MacGill Hughes, and Irwin Deutscher, Twenty Thousand Nurses Tell Their Story, Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1958, p. 22; Harry W. Martin and Ida Harper Simpson, Patterns of Psychiatric Nursing: A Study of Psychiatric Nursing in North Carolina, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Institute for Research in Social Science, 1956, p. 14; Douglas M. More, "A Note on Occupational Origins of the Health Service Professions," American Sociological Review, 25 (1960), p. 404; Alice I. Bryan, The Public Librarian, New York: Columbia University Press, 1952, pp. 34-36; Robert W. Habenstein and Edwin A. Christ, Professionalizer, Traditionalizer and Utilizer, 2nd ed., Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1963, p. 133.

Table VI-12, shown on a previous page, indicates that their husbands' occupational statuses made a difference in the future career commitment of the young women teachers in our sample. Negro women in all categories of marital status and husbands' occupation were more likely to plan lifelong careers in education than were white women in any category, but within the two racial groups considered separately the patterns of career commitment were similar. The women most likely to want to stop working and become full-time housewives were those married to men in white-collar occupations; those most likely to want lifelong classroom teaching careers were the wives of farmers or blue-collar workers; and those most likely to want to stay at work but in fields other than education were the unattached women. It should be noted that the question asked what the respondents wanted, not what they expected. The two questions are not unrelated since people tend to adjust their desires to the realities they face, but a question about expectations might have produced larger differences than the one asked about desires; and many wives of working-class men who said that they wanted to remain in teaching might not have wanted to if their husbands' incomes had been larger.

The family obligations of working women, especially if they have young children, place heavy demands on their time, leaving them less time than they would otherwise have to devote to professional activities. Hoffelder, studying the white North Carolina women in our sample, found that 60% of those in their twenties with preschool children felt "serious" or "some" conflice between "your work as a teacher and your household responsibilities," as compared with 30% of the women over fifty with no children in the home.[13] Table VI-13 shows that women who felt the most role conflict did, in fact, spend less time in professional activities than those who felt less role conflict, though the differences were not great. White women who felt some or serious role conflict were less likely than others to spend a lot of time in professional reading or to attend numerous professional meetings. Role conflict also reduced professional reading among Negro women, but not their attendance at professional meetings.

---

[13] Robert Lloyd Hoffelder, "The Married Woman School Teacher: A Study of Role Conflict," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964, pp. 20-22, 45.

TABLE VI-13. PERCENTAGES OF MARRIED WOMEN TEACHERS WHO SCORED HIGH ON READING INDEX AND WHO SPENT FIVE OR MORE DAYS A YEAR ATTENDING PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS, BY RACE AND AMOUNT OF ROLE CONFLICT

					Negroes			
	Reading (15: 3,4)		Meetings (165)		Reading (15: 3,4)		Meetings (165)	
Amount of Role Conflict	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Some or serious (95: 1,2)	26	(1914)	33	(1773)	47	(322)	68	(287)
Little or none (95: 3,4)	32	(2203)	39	(1987)	56	(559)	71	(492)

Table VI-14 is an attempt to discover in more detail the effects of family role pressures on professional activity. Especially among the white teachers, the data reveal less effect of family role pressures than we had expected to find, but shed further light on the professionalism, or lack of it, of young women teachers in general. Reading index scores tended to be low among mothers of preschool children, but equally low or lower among other women in their twenties, those who were married but childless and those who were not married. (Our "unattached" categories include all women who were not living with husbands, including those who were separated, divorced, widowed. Undoubtedly some of them had children to take care of, but it is safe to assume that most did not.) All of these yound women spent less time in professional reading than did the mothers of school-age children, most of whom were in their thirties. These last spent about the same amount of time in professional activities as did the childless married women over thirty and the men under forty. The most active groups were men over 40 and women whose children had grown up and left home. The patterns of difference were generally the same among Negroes as those among whites, but the differences were smaller among Negroes, and all categories of Negroes reported more professional activity than any category of whites. What the table seems to show is not the deprofessionalizing effects of family role obligations which we expected it to show, so much as a tendency of teachers to spend more time in professional activity as they grow older. In particular, young white women teachers spent very little time in professional reading, whether or not they had extensive family obligations. They did attend fewer meetings if they had preschool children than if they were unattached or childless. Whether or not competing family role obligations are the reason, it is clear that the large numbers of young white women who teach have a depressing effect on the level of professional activity in the occupation.

Women's compliant predispositions and deference to men. In organizational settings where there are rules to be followed and instructions to be obeyed, women seem to accept subordination more readily than men. Coleman's study of ten Illinois high schools found that girls were less likely than boys to make A grades but also less likely to make bad grades; girls' grades were bunched in the B category.[14] This finding suggests

---

[14] James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, New York: Free Press, 1961, pp. 252-253. See also Davis, Great Aspirations, op. cit., p. 29, for a related finding among college students. Coleman also found that individual girls' grades tended to be less spread over the range from A to F than boys' grades were. Boys were inclined to throw themselves wholeheartedly into subjects which interested them and ignore subjects which bored them, so that a boy might make A in one subject and D in another. Girls, in contrast, were relatively unlikely to become enthusiastic about any subject, but they plodded away and did their assignments in all subjects alike. The boys were liberated spirits and were correspondingly unreliable, whereas the girls were docile conformists.

TABLE VI-14. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS WHO SCORED HIGH ON READING INDEX AND WHO SPENT FIVE OR MORE DAYS A YEAR ATTENDING PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS, BY RACE AND FAMILY SITUATION TYPE

	Whites				Negroes			
	Reading (15: 3,4)		Meetings (165)		Reading (15: 3,4)		Meetings (165)	
Family Situation Types	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Men, age 40 and older	35	(377)	49	(351)	58	(150)	75	(144)
Men, age 39 and younger	33	(966)	38	(928)	52	(255)	69	(242)
Women, unattached, age 30 and older	31	(1093)	43	(992)	57	(273)	72	(236)
Women, unattached, age 29 and younger	20	(502)	36	(474)	43	(153)	72	(138)
Women, attached, no children, age 30 and older	32	(355)	40	(327)	58	(156)	72	(141)
Women, attached, no children, age 29 and younger	22	(805)	34	(748)	46	(125)	68	(103)
Women, attached, children living but none at home (empty nest)	39	(484)	45	(431)	49	(80)	63	(72)
Women, attached, children at home but none of preschool age	33	(1541)	38	(1390)	56	(276)	73	(235)
Women, attached, preschool children	23	(853)	28	(793)	49	(207)	68	(186)

two things, that the girls were reluctant to compete aggressively against boys for the top grades, and that they willingly did their assignments, thereby avoiding low grades. Findings among separate samples of college students reported by Rosenberg and Davis indicate that more women than men have the values which constitute what Rosenberg calls the "compliant personality type."[15] Compliant individuals as he defines them would prefer to be well liked than independent or successful, do not mind being dominated but dislike dominating others, and have a favorable, trusting view of human nature. Teaching was among the occupations most likely to be chosen by Rosenberg's most compliant students; and while compliant values were more often held by women than by men, the men who wanted to be teachers were more likely to have such values than were men who chose other occupations.[16]

Besides being more compliant in general than men, many women seem to think it proper that they should defer to men in organizational settings. The widespread feeling among the women teachers we studied that elementary teachers should be women but their principals should be men is evidence of this feeling. Zander, Cohen, and Stotland, studying female and male clinical psychologists, found that the women more readily accepted their subordination to psychiatrists than the men did.[17] Situations in which men have women bosses are apt to cause embarrassment on both sides, unless wide differences in social class or educational background match the organizational status differences. Thus, for example, registered nurses can supervise uneducated hospital orderlies without either of them seeing anything improper or confusing in the situation, but a woman who is promoted to a supervisory position over men who formerly were her equals is likely to experience some discomfort. Cussler notes that even such everyday problems as deciding who should pick up lunch checks or initiate coffee breaks can cause embarrassment in such situations.[18]

The compliant predispostions of women and the tendency of many of them to feel that they should defer to men may be among the reasons why

---

15. Rosenberg, op. cit., p. 42; Davis, Great Aspirations, op. cit., p. 34.

16. Rosenberg, op. cit., pp. 46-47.

17. Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland, Role Relations in the Mental Health Professions, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Research Center for Group Dynamics, 1957, pp. 39-81.

18. Margaret Cussler, The Woman Executive, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1958.

so few women teachers seek to become principals, though the women's general lack of career ambition is probably a more important reason; in most elementary schools, a woman principal would have few or no male teachers to supervise. Still another reason may be a realization by women that they are likely to be discriminated against in the selection of principals, since the people who select principals often share the prevailing opinion that a man is better for the job if one is available. In any event, most principals are men, most teachers are women, and the docility of women probably reinforces other factors which work in favor of bureaucratic control and against professional autonomy and collegial control in schools.

Desire for friendly work atmosphers. Rosenberg's mainly feminine "compliant personality type," which we have discussed above, includes a strong desire for interpersonal warmth and friendliness along with a willingness to play a subordinate role. Studying undergraduates in two universities, Simpson and Simpson found that 68% of the women but only 57% of the men said that friendly relations with fellow workers would be very important to them in evaluating a job.[19] Experiments on coalition formation by Vinacke and associates indicate that while men are more likely to bargain aggressively and seek power, women are more interested in reaching a "fair and friendly solution to the problem."[20]

As of 1969 there is a movement afoot among some anthropologists and ethologists to regard the sexes as innately different in temperament and to ascribe the kinds of feminine characteristics we have been discussing to biology, Margaret Mead to the contrary notwithstanding. It is not our intention to become embroiled in this old nature-nurture controversy, but merely to suggest that for whatever reason, women in the United States are more desirous of friendliness and sociability on the job than men are. Possible innate differences aside, it is reasonable to expect that any group of workers who do not place a high value on occupational success will seek other goals at work instead, including a pleasant social atmosphere unmarred by the bruises of aggressive competition.

---

[19] Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, unpublished data. The study is discussed in two papers by Simpson and Simpson, but the papers do not give directly comparable data for men and women. The articles are "Values, Personal Influence, and Occupational Choice," Social Forces, 39 (1960), pp. 116-125; and "Occupational Choice among Career-Oriented College Women," Marriage and Family Living, 23 (1961), pp. 377-383.

[20] W. Edgar Vinacke, "Sex Roles in a Three-Person Game," Sociometry, 22 (1959), pp. 343-360, quoted at p. 357; John R. Bond and W. Edgar Vinacke, "Coalitions in Mixed-Sex Triads," Sociometry, 24 (1961), pp. 61-75; Thomas K. Uesugi and W. Edgar Vinacke, "Strategy in a Feminine Game," Sociometry, 26 (1963), pp. 75-88.

Table VI-15 clearly supports the hypothesis that women teachers' satisfaction with their jobs would be more influenced by the presence or absence of friendly work atmospheres than men's would be. The table compares the percentages of men and women who evaluated their current jobs favorably, among those who described their principals as socially distant or not distant from teachers and who differed in how much they like their colleagues. The principal's social distance and the liking of colleagues had more effect on women's than on men's job satisfaction.

Subtracting the percentages who were satisfied with their jobs among teachers who rated their principals in the most socially distant category from the percentages who were satisfied among those who placed their principals in the least socially distant category, we find a difference of 19% among the male respondents and 29% among the women. The differences in the percentages who were satisfied with their jobs between teachers who liked their colleagues very well and those who liked them less well were 11% among the men and 20% among the women. Figures not given in the table indicate that both of these relationships existed among Negroes and whites separately. Similar patterns would be seen if the percentages who rated their jobs as outstanding, rather than merely above average (plus outstanding) were shown as the dependent variable. The hypothesis was also supported by data using perceived value similarity of colleagues (variable 64) and the attraction to colleagues index (variable 65, which is composed of liking of colleagues and perceived value similarity) as dependent variables; these data are not shown because the information the table gives seems sufficient to make the point.

While friendly work atmospheres increased the job satisfaction of teachers, and especially of women teachers, it will be recalled from Chapter V that friendly and supportive work situations did not make teachers more professional. In this latter respect, men and women were similar. As Rosenberg has shown, the desire for warm interpersonal relations goes along with the tendency to be compliant and submissive. The whole syndrome fits well with a bureaucratic pattern of control by hierarchical authority and rules, in which no one rocks the boat.

Holistic service orientations. Teachers, like other semi-professional workers, are characterized by strong motivations to be of service to others. A service orientation is sometimes included in definitions of professionalism, but in Chapter I we gave our reasons for thinking that including it is not a good idea. Whether or not one accepts the argument that was given there, the service orientation which is sometimes said to be a hallmark of the professions refers to the obligation to subordinate personal gain to the welfare of clients when the two are in conflict, and this is not the same thing as the humanitarian service motive which is common among semi-professional women.

TABLE VI-15. PERCENTAGES OF MEN AND WOMEN TEACHERS WHO SAID THAT THEIR JOBS WERE BETTER THAN MOST TEACHING POSITIONS, BY SOCIAL DISTANCE OF PRINCIPAL AND LIKING OF COLLEAGUES

	Satisfied with Jobs	
	Men % (N)	Women % (N)
Independent Variables and Responses		
Said principal often associated informally with teachers (47: 1)	64 (746)	69 (3091)
Said principal associated informally with teachers from time to time (47: 2)	56 (722)	59 (3218)
Said principal rarely or never associated informally with teachers (47: 3,4)	45 (275)	40 (1089)
Liked other teachers in school very well (63: 1)	61 (1163)	65 (5692)
Liked other teachers in school fairly well, not much, or not at all (63: 2,3,4)	50 (575)	45 (1714)

The most sophisticated analysis of the service aspect of professional-client relations is Parsons'. Parsons describes the relationship in its ideal-typical form as functionally specific, instrumental, affectively neutral, and universalistic.[21] The dentist, the doctor, the architect, or the lawyer applies his skills to the solution of specific, limited problems brought to him by the client. The relationship can be impersonal and businesslike, it has nothing to do with love or friendship, and if a personal bond is established, it can be harmful because the sentiments of friendship can mar the objectivity of the professional's judgment. It is for this reason that doctors do not customarily treat members of their own families, but send them to other doctors.

The service orientation which is prevalent among semi-professionals is quite different. It involves a strong humanitarian urge to give of oneself and to establish a functionally diffuse, expressive, particularistic attachment to the recipient of the service. Professional activity can be expressive and can bring deep emotional satisfaction, but the satisfaction comes more from the chance to flex intellectual muscles than from the grateful response of the client. The client may be regarded primarily as an object upon whom skills are exercised. Thus Ida Simpson found that while student nurses might speak of the kindly, lovable patient in Room 226, doctors were more likely to refer to him as a kidney malfunction or a hernia.[22] We use the term holistic service emphasis or orientation to refer to the desire to relate to the client as a whole person. Holistic values are not professional values, and in some ways they are precisely the opposite.

There is ample evidence that the semi-professions staffed mainly by women are characterized by holistic service values. Nurses, librarians, social workers, and teachers are noted for such values.[23] Wilensky and Lebeaux point out that these occupations offer ideal opportunities for nurturance; the clients are helpless or socially dependent people such as the sick, the needy, and small children, and the work can be regarded as an extension of feminine family roles.[24]

---

[21] Talcott Parsons, The Social System, New York: Free Press, 1951, pp. 434-436.

[22] Ida Harper Simpson, "The Development of Professional Self-Images among Student Nurses," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1956.

[23] See for example, Rosenberg, op. cit., pp. 26-27; Davis, Great Aspirations, op. cit., p. 173; Kaspar D. Naegele and Elaine Culley Stolar, "Income and Prestige," Library Journal, 85 (1960), pp. 2888-2891; Alvin W. Gouldner, "The Secrets of Organizations," in The Social Welfare Forum, 1963, Official Proceedings, 90th Annual Forum, National Conference on Social Welfare, New York: Columbia University Press, 1963, pp. 162-164; Norman Polansky, William Bowen, Lucille Gordon, and Conrad Nathan, "Social Workers in Society," Journal of Social Work, 34 (1953), pp. 74-80; Habenstein and Christ, op. cit., p. 73; Hughes, Hughes, and Deutscher, op. cit., p. 214.

We have shown in Chapter III (Table III-1) that holistic orientations were the rule among the teachers we studied. Heavy majorities of them were bothered when they had to give a child an F and described "spending a lot of time with children" as a good aspect of teaching; when asked if they were more interested in children or in subject matter, more said that they were interested mainly in children; and more than half scored 3 or 4 on our 4-point holistic service emphasis index, meaning that they agreed that "teachers should concern themselves with students' emotional problems" and that "teachers who regard their work as a way to give humanitarian service should be praised and rewarded the most highly." (Appendix C describes the scoring of this index.) It has also been shown (Chapter IV, Table IV-4) that the women were more holistic than the men in all of these respects, and that controlling for elementary vs. secondary teaching level reduced the size of the sex differences but did not make them disappear.

Lack of colleague reference group and collegial authority orientations. A strong influence for colleague group cohesion in some occupations is what Lipset, Trow, and Coleman have called "occupational community."[25] Friendships made at work are carried into private life, so that the worker spends most of his time, other than the time spent with his family, with members of his occupation. Occupational community may be almost complete among farmers and isolated rural workers such as miners, but modern urban occupations vary widely in their degree of it.[26]

When workers are emotionally attached to their work, they are inclined to talk shop when they get together, on or off the job. More than this, when their degree of occupational community is high, they come to have similar opinions on a variety of subjects, some directly related to their work and others not, and the more they associate with each other, the more they feel that they are a distinctive community with a subculture all their own. Occupational communities of this kind are especially strong in highly professional groups with distinctive value systems, particularly if some of the values are different from those of the average man and the average man knows this. Career military officers and college professors, for example, are regarded with a certain amount of suspicion by many people, and they tend to return the compliment by thinking that everyone is out of step but them. One effect of such an occupational community is that its members become somewhat intolerant of differing opinions and those who hold them. A defensive and intolerant feeling toward outsiders reinforces the separateness of a group. The whole process cements individual members' commitment to the occupation and its skills and values, strengthens their occupational reference group orientations, and gives them a sense of esprit de corps and moral certitude which makes them willing to fight for their prerogatives as a group. They may be a bit hard for anyone who does not share their prejudices to live with, but they are highly professional in outlook and they may do their job better as a result of this.

---

[24] Harold L. Wilensky and Charles N. Lebeaux, Industrial Society and Social Welfare, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958, pp. 322-323.

[25] Seymour Martim Lipset, Martin Trow, and James S. Coleman, Union Democracy, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1962, pp. 77-159, 257-260, 413-418; Joel E. Gerstl, "Determinants of Occupational Community in High-Status Occupations," Sociological Quarterly, 2 (1961), pp. 37-48; Blauner, op. cit.; Peter J. Fensham and Douglas Hooper, The Dynamics of a Changing Technology, London: Tavistock, 1964, p. 150.

[26] Gerstl, op. cit.

Semi-professional women appear to have a fairly high degree of occupational community, but not of a professionalizing kind. Studying children's librarians, Wheeler found that the ones who spent the most off-duty time with fellow librarians were not the most professionally motivated or the most active in professional associations.[27] Our findings point to the same conclusion. Table VI-16 shows substantial percentages of teachers rating high in occupational community, "high" meaning that they got together socially more often with teachers than with non-teachers. Negro teachers were much higher than whites in occupational community, and the fact that Negroes were on the whole more professional than whites might suggest that occupational community had professionalizing effects; but a number of findings presented earlier show that within each racial group considered separately, occupational community was related to very few professional variables, and not always in a positive direction. (See Chapter III, Tables III-8 through III-14, III-17, III-21, and III-22, and the discussions of these tables.) Table VI-16 shows a higher than average amount of occupational community among unmarried teachers, most of them young, and it was shown earlier in this chapter (Table VI-13) that young teachers were the least active professionally.

---

[27] Sara H. Wheeler, "Children's Librarians of the Northwest," in Morton Kroll (ed.), Libraries and Librarians of the Pacific Northwest, Pacific Northwest Library Association, Library Development Project Reports, Vol. IV, 1960, pp. 150-151.

TABLE VI-16. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS WITH HIGH OCCUPATIONAL COMMUNITY, BY RACE, SEX, MARITAL STATUS, AND OCCUPATION OF SPOUSE

Sex, Marital Status, and Occupation of Spouse	Whites	Negroes
	% High (106: 1,2) (N)	% High (106: 1,2) (N)
Men, single, separated, divorced, or widowed	36	74
	(282)	(86)
Women, single, separated, divorced, or widowed	40	73
	(1830)	(519)
Men married to teachers or principals	42	74
	(273)	(157)
Women married to teachers or principals	44	83
	(391)	(214)
Men married to other employed wives	22	56
	(280)	(86)
Women married to other employed husbands	23	66
	(3392)	(617)
Men married to unemployed wives	29	46
	(470)	(69)
Women married to unemployed husbands*	25	75
	(263)	(28)

*We lack data on the nature of the unemployed husbands, but probably most of them were students, and most of the remainder either retired or disabled. Two things suggest that most were students. First, the indicated unemployment rates of white husbands were higher than those existing in the regions sampled at the time of the study, though the average education of the husbands was well above the national average. Second, the unemployment rate of white husbands was twice that of Negro husbands, 6.5% vs. 3.3%. Students are not "unemployed" in the sense used in reporting official unemployment statistics, but the question asked the respondent to check if the spouse was "not gainfully employed" and gave no separate category for students.

One plausible hypothesis to account for an absence of professionalizing effects of occupational community would be that most teachers are women but most middle-class social activity involves friendships initiated by the husband rather than the wife. Studying middle-class couples in Lincoln, Nebraska, Babchuk and Bates found that the husbands had initiated many more friendships than the wives, and that friendships initiated by husbands tended to be closer than those initiated by wives.[28] They attributed these findings to "male dominance," which would seem to describe what they found but not to explain it.

Our data in Table VI-16 give no support at all to the hypothesis that male dominance in friendship formation might explain the lack of professionalizing effects of occupational community among teachers, and the data may incidentally provide an explanation for the Babchuk-Bates findings. Among white teachers and unmarried Negroes, women were about as likely as men to report high occupational community. Among married Negroes, it was the women who were higher, not the men. That the occupational community reported by both married men and married women represented mainly friendships with couples rather than individual friendships of one or the other spouse is strongly suggested by the fact that occupational community was considerably more prevalent among those married to teachers or principals than among those married to non-teachers. From all of this it is reasonable to guess that occupational community, not any generalized pattern of male dominance in the family, may explain the pattern observed by Babchuk and Bates. They were studying middle-class couples, and it is probable that many of the wives in their sample were not employed and therefore had no chance to meet people at work.

Sheer opportunity to meet people is also the most probable reason for the far greater degree of occupational community among the Negro teachers we studied than among the whites, given that people usually choose friends from their own social class. Especially in small southern communities, Negro teachers who wish to get together with other middle-class Negroes may have few people to choose from except each other.

In any event, while a fairly high amount of occupational community was evident among the white teachers and an extremely high amount of it among Negroes, professionalization did not appear to have resulted from it. Teachers who spent their off-duty time with other teachers were no more professional than those who did not. We have no data which would shed light on why this was so, and can only speculate. Perhaps when teachers got together they did not talk shop, and perhaps if they did talk shop the effect was to solidify unprofessional attitudes instead of professional ones. More likely, their off-the-job social activities simply were not translated into professionalizing interaction or solidarity on the job. Solidarity on the job rather than directly professionalizing conversation off the job is probably the chief effect of occupational community in occupations where it does enhance professionalism. There is no reason to suppose that battlefield tactics, the latest scientific theories, or whatnot are the prime topics of conversation when people in more professional occupations get together over cocktails, but in these cases the social relationships are carried back into the work setting and the result seems to enhance professionalism.[29] This did not seem to happen among our teachers. Data given in Chapter III indicated that occupational community was not related to the frequency with which teachers consulted each other about work problems or to their use of colleagues as a reference group.

---

[28] Nicholas Babchuk and Alan P. Bates, "The Primary Relations of Middle-Class Couples: A Study of Male Dominance," American Sociological Review, 28 (1963), pp. 377-384; Nicholas Babchuk, "Primary Friends and Kin: A Study of the Associations of Middle-Class Couples," Social Forces, 43 (1965), pp. 483-493.

One reason why the occupational community of teachers was apparently not reflected in greater cohesiveness or orientation to colleague group autonomy and power at work may have been the mixture of men and women on many teaching staffs, coupled with the lack of teaching career commitment. The weight of research evidence suggests that colleague solidarity in mixed-sex work groups is often hampered by social distance between the sexes.[30] This would seem especially likely if a large proportion of group members are psychologically oriented away from the group, the women wanting to become full-time housewives and the men hoping to be promoted into the ranks of management.

---

29. See, for example, James S. Coleman, Elihu Katz, and Herbert Menzel, "The Diffusion of Innovations among Physicians," Sociometry, 20 (1957), pp. 253-270. They found that the doctors most integrated into informal colleague networks were the first to adopt new drugs.

30. Katherine Archibald, War Time Shipyard, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1947, pp. 15-39; Jessie Bernard, Academic Women, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964; John James, "Clique Organization in a Small Industrial Plant," Pacific Sociological Review, Research Studies, State College of Washington, 19 (1941), pp. 126-129; Stan R. Nikkel, "Characteristics of the Informal Organization: An Observational Study of the United States Committee for UNICEF," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964, pp. 97-110. However, no relation was found between sex homogeneity of work groups and work group cohesion in the welfare agencies studied by Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco: Chandler, 1962, p. 109.

Effects on Organizations

If women's orientations to work are different from those of men, this fact is bound to influence not only the behavior of individual workers in predominantly feminine occupations, but the functioning of the organizations where they work. Organizations which employ semi-professional women in large numbers tend to be authoritarian in administrative style. The employees are bound by numerous rules and they expect to be told what to do, often in considerable detail which leaves them little latitude. They are usually required to submit elaborate reports of their activities, a clear indication that they are not trusted to work on their own as professionals. Major decisions affecting the organization tend to be made without consulting them. In schools, the principal is not obligated to consult teachers about educational policies, and data reported by Gross and Herriott suggest that many principals make little effort to do so.[31] Corwin reports that teachers who were high in "professional" ideology and low in "bureaucratic-employee ideology" had unusually high rates of conflict with administrators.[32]

Our own data indicate that principals rarely sought the advice of teachers. The teachers were asked, "How often does the principal ask you for advice or for your opinions on school matters affecting you?" Only 44% (N = 9211) claimed that he consulted them as often as once a month. The teachers did not seem to object to this very much. Table VI-17 shows that being consulted by the principal once a month or more increased teachers' job satisfaction, but job satisfaction was increased by an equal amount if the principal associated informally with teachers. If a principal wanted to keep his staff happy, apparently he could do so just as well by acting friendly as by showing an interest in their opinions.

---

[31] Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools, New York: Wiley, 1965, pp. 121-122. They do not report exactly how many of the principals they studied consulted teachers before making decisions, but it is clear from their discussion that many did not. Other discussions give an impression of less variation among principals and more thorough subordination of teachers than Gross and Herriott's data seem to indicate. See, for example, Corwin, op. cit., pp. 218-219; Howard S. Becker, "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," Journal of Educational Sociology, 27 (1953), pp. 129-141.

[32] Ronald G. Corwin, "Militant Professionalism, Initiative, and Compliance in Public Education," Sociology of Education, 38 (1965), pp. 310-331; see the table on p. 320.

TABLE VI-17. PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS WHO SAID THAT THEIR JOBS WERE BETTER THAN MOST TEACHING POSITIONS, BY FREQUENCY OF PRINCIPAL'S CONSULTATION WITH TEACHERS AND PRINCIPAL'S SOCIAL DISTANCE FROM TEACHERS

Independent Variables and Responses	Pleased with Jobs	
	%	(N)
Said principal asked teacher for advice or opinion once a month or more (50: 1,2,3,4)	68	(4016)
Said principal asked teacher for advice or opinion less than once a month (50: 0)	54	(5195)
Said principal often associated informally with teachers (47:1)	67	(3946)
Said principal associated informally with teachers from time to time, rarely, or never (47: 2,3,4)	54	(5465)

We have argued that the predominance of women in the teaching occupation is a major reason why schools are run bureaucratically rather than along collegial professional lines. Table VI-18 lends some support to this assertion, by suggesting that when most teachers in a school were women, the men on the teaching staff were influenced toward greater submissiveness. Men were less likely to be strongly in favor of involvement of teachers in policy decisions, and more likely to believe that teachers should avoid making public statements on controversial matters, in schools with few male teachers than in schools with many male teachers. Some of the difference shown in the table is due to the fact that most schools with few male teachers were elementary schools, and elementary teachers in general were more bureaucratically submissive than secondary teachers were; but the differences shown in Table VI-18 existed in both elementary and secondary schools separately, and they were greater than the elementary-vs.-secondary differences found in the total sample of teachers (Table IV-2). The sex composition of the teaching staff did not, however, seem to affect the men's holistic service orientations.

There are thus numerous indications that women are less likely than men to have work orientations favorable to professionalism, and there is some indication that men are influenced in an unprofessional direction when they work in mainly feminine settings. Principals operate their schools in bureaucratic fashion, issuing instructions and not consulting teachers before they do so. Schools, like other semiprofessional organizations, would probably be run bureaucratically regardless of the sex of their employees, because teachers lack the specialized knowledge upon which professionals base their claims to autonomy. But the fact that so many teachers are women does seem to enhance the tendency to bureaucracy. Principals adapt their behavior to the prevailing view that men should properly exercise authority over women, and they meet with very little resistance to this notion among the teachers. The habit of command, once acquired, persists in their dealings with all teachers, male or female.

The high turnover of teacher personnel is probably an additional bureaucratizing factor, and much of the turnover is directly attributable to teaching's being mainly a woman's occupation. Not only do women come and go as their family life cycles and economic needs dictate. Many a woman leaves because her husband's career takes him to a different community. These are direct effects of having women employees on rates of turnover, and there are also indirect effects. When one teacher leaves, a vacancy is created, which may be filled by a different teacher who leaves her previous job to take the new one; in extreme instances the situation may resemble a game of musical chairs. High rates of turnover reduce the cohesion of colleague groups, and may make a high degree of bureaucratization not only possible but necessary. A work group which is not cohesive is unlikely to develop a set of well understood informal

TABLE VI-18. ATTITUDES OF MALE TEACHERS TOWARD ASPECTS OF HOLISM, POWER, AND AUTONOMY, BY SEX COMPOSITION OF FACULTIES OF THEIR SCHOOLS

Dependent Variables and Responses	Many Men on Faculty (149S: 1,2) % (N)	Few Men on Faculty (149S: 3,4) % (N)
Low holistic service emphasis index (23: 0,1,2)	43 (825)	41 (75)
Were not bothered by giving an F (item B69: 1)	28 (841)	26 (77)
Were more interested in subject matter than in children, or equally interested in both (162: 1,2,3,4)	57 (817)	55 (75)
Strongly favored policy involvement (16: 1)	44 (842)	37 (78)
Did not think teachers should avoid controversial community activity (104: 1,2)	78 (842)	59 (78)

norms, and a group which lacks a subculture of this kind is poorly equipped to resist bureaucratic domination, or to work out solutions to unforeseen contingencies without being given formal instructions to deal with them.

For all these reasons a typical school comes to resemble a bureaucracy, where employees are governed by rules and instructions, more than an organization of professionals who govern themselves.

CHAPTER VII

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE TO PROFESSIONALIZE TEACHERS?

The findings of this study point to the conclusion that teaching is not a highly professional occupation, given the definition of professionalism we started out with. In Chapter I, professionalism was defined as an attitude and behavior set stemming from orientation to specialized knowledge and including desire for autonomy and the use of colleagues as a reference group. Additional aspects of professionalism related to these primary defining characteristics of it were noted: intrinsic commitment to work and the knowledge it embodies, and orientations to work tasks which are functionally specific, universalistic, and affectively neutral. By these criteria, most of the teachers we studied were not very professional. In addition, Chapter III presented six general hypotheses describing conditions one would expect to find in a profession; data on teachers and on college students preparing to be teachers did not support the hypotheses.

What might be done to make teachers more professional? Probably not much. The occupation lacks the essential foundation stone of professionalism, a codified body of abstract knowledge from which work skills are derived, created by members of the occupation rather than borrowed from others. Professionalism is not an either-or matter, however, but a matter of degree. Therefore it seems worthwhile to examine some possible steps which might be taken to increase professionalism among teachers, if society wants them to be more professional.

This last qualifier is important, for it is quite conceivable that professionalism is not an unalloyed blessing, despite the éclat which the word conveys. Professionals regulate themselves and are largely free from control by outsiders, including organizational superiors; often they misuse this power, and a cogent argument could be made for the belief, to which many people would no doubt subscribe, that teachers ought not to have it. It is also possible that teachers do a better job, particularly in elementary schools, if their orientations are those of holistic service rather than the functionally specific, affectively neutral, and some would say stony-hearted orientations of professionals.

We shall assume, however, that professionalism is desirable, and consider in this chapter some ways in which teachers might conceivably be made more professional. The possibilities to be discussed are creating more professional situations in the schools, educating future teachers differently with a view to making more of them professional, and selectively recruiting teacher trainees who are predisposed to professionalism. The analysis will be value-free, in two senses. First, policies designed to increase professionalism can be regarded as policies to be fought against by anyone who deems professionalism undesirable. Second, we suggest no policies anyway, for we are led by our research and analysis to conclude that nothing is likely to happen, and perhaps nothing could possibly happen, to change the fundamental reasons why teaching is only a semi-profession.

Creating More Professional Situations

A professional situation is one which encourages professionalism. In such a situation the climate of opinion is professional, the most professional people are the most career-committed and satisfied, role-set relations support and reward professional behavior and attitudes, and newcomers are quickly made aware that these conditions exist.

Our research did not uncover any variables which were related to the professionalism of school situations, except individual characteristics of teachers which they brought with them to the job and which will be discussed later. The fact that a school stood higher than most in one aspect of professionalism had little or no relation to its degree of professionalism in other respects. The teachers themselves seemed generally contented with their role of bureaucratic subordinates, and disinclined to assert professional prerogatives. We found a number of aspects of teachers' role-set relations which made a difference in how satisfied they were with their jobs. In particular, job satisfaction was highest when role-set relations, especially with the principal, were friendly and supportive; but it was warmth and support rather than a chance to behave like free professionals which the teachers appeared to want most, and the presence of conditions which increased teachers' satisfaction had little effect one way or the other on their professionalism. If a principal was democratic in administrative style, his teachers tended to be more satisfied than if he was authoritarian, but democratic administration did not make the teachers more professional, and the principal's friendliness had as much effect on teacher satisfaction as his degree of democracy in administration had. This conclusion is buttressed by Haralick's finding that teacher satisfaction was increased more if the principal was considered a good disciplinarian and stood up for teachers against parents and students than if he was democratic in administrative style.[1]

Even if teachers were actively to seek professional conditions in their schools, it is not likely that most principals would be inclined to grant them. Over half the teachers in our sample said that their principals consulted them about matters affecting them less than once a month. The teachers who hoped to become principals were about as unprofessional in general outlook as other teachers were, a fact which suggests that principals are not likely in the future to be sources of professionalizing innovations. Other studies have also found that an authoritarian administrative style is the most common one among school principals--benign authoritarianism, apparently, for most teachers think rather well of their principals, but authoritarianism none the less.[2]

---

[1] Joy Gold Haralick, "Teacher Acceptance of Administrative Action," Journal of Experimental Education, 37 (1968), pp. 39-47.

The principal's hands are, in any case, tied by legal and administrative restrictions on his own freedom, and by the prevailing sentiments of the community, so that it would be risky for him to grant much autonomy to teachers if he felt so disposed. In most school jurisdictions, much of the curriculum including the choice of textbooks and other teaching materials is imposed on the principal, and his teachers, from above. Community codes which restrict even the off-duty behavior of teachers have been greatly relaxed in recent years, but they still exist.[3] A public which is reluctant to let teachers decide whether to drink alcohol or wear short skirts is not likely to turn over fundamental educational decisions to them.

It may be well to point out that the educational ferment of the 1960's, among teachers and the public, does not contradict our thesis that most teachers are docile bureaucratic subordinates and the public wants them to remain so. The main thrust of the rise in teacher unionism and militancy is not toward professionalism but toward traditional labor union objectives. Militant teacher groups have sought collective power to get higher pay, job security, and sometimes increased expenditures for buildings and other educational paraphernalia, but they have not shown much interest in stripping the principal of his authority over teachers, or in advancing the scientific knowledge of the educational process or the scholarliness of teachers. The big-city school bureaucracies which are sometimes accused of reacting like Pavlov's dogs against innovations in education are staffed by people who began as teachers and appear to reflect the prevailing values of the occupation. Demands from citizens for control of schools by neighborhoods (white) or communities (black) are similar to the rear-guard actions of rural people in opposition to school consolidation. All of these citizen movements seek to take control of education away from educators, not to give it to them. None of these various educational upheavals suggests either that teachers are suddenly trying to become more professional, or that the public is in a mood to allow them the autonomy it grants to occupations it considers to be professional.

---

[2] Howard S. Becker, "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public Schools," Journal of Educational Sociology, 27 (1953), pp. 129-141; Ronald G. Corwin, A Sociology of Education, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965, pp. 218-219; Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools, New York: Wiley, 1965, pp. 121-122.

[3] On community control over schools and teacher behavior, directly or through boards and superintendents, see George S. Counts, School and Society in Chicago, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928; Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching, New York: Wiley, 1932, pp. 43-66; Howard K. Beale, Are American Teachers Free?, New York: Scribner's, 1936, pp. 374-409; Lloyd A. Cook, Ronald B. Almack, and Florence Greenhoe, "The Teacher and Community Relations," American Sociological Review, 3 (1938), pp. 167-174; Florence Greenhoe, Community Contacts and Participation of Teachers, Washington: American Council on Public Affairs, 1941, pp. 40-61; Neal Gross, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role, New York: Wiley, 1958; Neal Gross, Who Runs Our Schools? New York: Wiley, 1958; Lloyd Manwiller, "Expectations Regarding Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, 26 (1958), pp. 315-354; Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society, Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958, pp. 174-201; Hugh Max Miller, "Teacher Roles and Community Integration," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964, pp. 36-37, 55-57, 89-92, 116-120, 133.

In short, conditions do not seem ripe for the creation of more professional situations in the public schools.

Training Future Teachers for Professionalism

Changing the curricula or training techniques to which future teachers are exposed might seem an obvious way to professionalize them, but unfortunately little or nothing is known about what sorts of changes would be needed to do the job. It is not even known what effects the current training programs have on professionalism in different occupations, for different studies have reached different conclusions. For example, Ida Simpson found that student nurses began their nursing education with strongly holistic values but that the program changed their orientations in the direction of functional specificity and affective neutrality, but Becker and Geer maintain that medical students, after undergoing a similar shift while in medical school, promptly revert to their original humanitarian service motives when they graduate.[4] Our own data on education majors in fourteen colleges indicate that those who had been the most exposed to the curriculum and who had had the most informal contact with other education majors and faculty members were in most respects neither more nor less professional than the others. (Chapter III, Table III-3.)

---

[4] Ida Harper Simpson, "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, 37 (1967), pp. 47-54; Howard S. Becker and Blanche Geer, "The Fate of Idealism in Medical School," American Sociological Review, 23 (1958), pp. 50-56.

Apart from the question of professionalism, there appear to be shortcomings in existing programs of teacher education as preparation for what the teachers face when they start teaching. Questionnaire data obtained by Gates from practice teachers indicated that many of them saw little connection between what their courses had taught them about education and what they needed to know once they were on the job.[5] Wagenschein observed a similar phenomenon and labeled it "reality shock."[6] What Gates' student teachers tended to want was, however, not more mastery of an abstract body of knowledge which they could apply to a variety of situations, but helpful hints on how to deal with concrete problems, such as what to do with boys who squirt girls with water pistols. Many of them complained that their courses in pedagogy were "too abstract." To make the teacher training program less theoretical and focus it more on how-to-do-it rules of thumb would plainly not be a step in the direction of professionalism.

But if teacher education curriculum planners were to decide that their students must be force-fed more theoretical knowledge whether they want it or not, this decision would not tell them what kind of theoretical knowledge to impart. More psychology of learning? More sociological analysis of how children's families and peer groups affect their attitudes toward education? More knowledge of the subjects the future teachers will teach? No one really knows the answers to these kinds of questions, although many have volunteered to answer them. They are perennial questions because they have remained perennially unanswered.

Let us imagine, however, that we knew exactly what sorts of knowledge and values should be inculcated in future teachers. The next question would be how to inculcate them. Research bearing on the ability of colleges and universities to alter students' values in predetermined directions is not encouraging. For example, conscious efforts to turn students into liberal small-d democrats appear to have little effect; college does often liberalize students' beliefs, but this happens mainly through adventitious intellectual osmosis from the subcultural atmosphere.[7] Selective recruitment into occupations and the work situation in which the worker finds himself after his training is completed usually have more to do with his work orientations than the training process has, and socialization which has lasting effects on values is not usually possible except in cloistered training institutions which screen their applicants for admission rigorously and subject them to very strict discipline, such as nunneries and military academies.[8] When novice trainees are not preselected to make sure that they already have the appropriate values, the main effect of trying to cram professional orientations into them may be to make those who do not already have these orientations drop out of the training program.[9] Rigorous screening of applicants and, even more, cloistered training centers with strenuous disciplinary regimens would obviously be impractical for an occupation with large manpower needs such as teaching.

---

[5] Davida P. Gates, "The Professional Socialization of Student Teachers in North Carolina," unpublished M. A. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964, pp. 74-80.

[6] Miriam Wagenschein, "Reality Shock," unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1951.

Granting this, it might still seem possible to stiffen the requirements within the existing teacher training programs, since an orientation to specialized knowledge is the core of professionalism. But such an attempt might be risky, for our findings and those of other researchers suggest that many potential teachers would be frightened off if the preparation were made more intellectually demanding. As we reported in Chapter III (Table III-2), education majors were less likely than other students to have chosen their careers because of intrinsic interest in the work. This same table shows education majors studying just as much and making about the same grades as non-education majors, and Davis' national study found the same thing;[10] but this may mean that the grading was easier in the courses education majors took, rather than that they were equal to non-education students in academic ability, for Wolfle found education students ranking fifth from the bottom among nineteen fields in intelligence test scores of post-graduate students.[11] If teaching careers appeal mainly to students of average or below average ability, the chief result of more stringent intellectual demands on them might be to reduce the number of students choosing to enter the field.

---

[7] On the futility of conscious efforts to change students' values, see Philip Jacob, Changing Values in College, New York: Harper, 1957. On unplanned change through exposure to an attitudinal milieu, see Theodore M. Newcomb, Personality and Social Change, New York: Dryden, 1943; and Claude Dahmer, Jr. and Elliot McGinnis, "Shifting Sentiments toward Civil Rights in a Southern University," Public Opinion Quarterly, 13 (1949), pp. 241-251. The latter study, which has received less attention than it deserves, found that southern students at the University of Alabama became more liberal in racial attitudes as they progressed from the freshman to the senior year, while northern students became less liberal, so that the southern and northern students ended much more alike than they began, though some regional differential remained.

[8] A penetrating analysis of recruitment, socialization, and the relation between the two is given in Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, New York: Free Press, 1961, pp. 141-160.

[9] Charles R. Wright, "Changes in the Occupational Commitment of Graduate Sociology Students: A Research Note," Sociological Inquiry, 37 (1967), pp. 55-62.

Moreover, the attrition might be greatest among those students who are the most committed to careers in education. The Negro teachers we studied were more likely than whites to have lifelong career commitments to the field of education (though not to classroom teaching), and any stiffening of academic requirements would probably drive off larger proportions of Negro than of white students. Men have more career commitment than women, and Davis found that lack of scholarly zeal was more pronounced among male than female education majors.[12] This sex difference also existed among the education majors we studied; 51% of the women (N=802) but only 34% of the men (N=338) claimed to have made grade averages of B- or better the previous semester. It thus appears that the academic preparation and proficiency of these categories of education students are in reverse order of their commitment to careers in education. White women are the best students and the least career-committed, Negroes are more career-committed than whites but are less well prepared academically, and white men are intermediate in both respects. Among whites, a disproportionate number of teachers, in comparison with other college graduates, have come from rural and lower-class backgrounds, as we shall show later in this chapter. This probably means that a disproportionate number of white education students have come to college with inferior academic preparation.

The manpower recruitment implications of any stiffening of a academic requirements for education majors, given these facts about their backgrounds and scholarly inclinations, seem sufficiently evident. The teachers coming out of the stiffer programs would be more intellectually oriented than most teachers now are, but there would be fewer of them, and an even higher percentage than at present would be white women whose chief desire was to stop teaching as soon as they could. A logical inference from the findings about male vs. female scholarly proficiency among education students, which is not directly relevant to our argument but offers food for thought, is that most teachers are supervised by persons less intelligent than themselves, since most teachers are women but most principals are men.

---

[10] James A. Davis, Undergraduate Career Decisions, Chicago: Aldine, 1965, pp. 17-36.

[11] Dael Wolfle, America's Resources of Specialized Talent, New York: Harper, 1954, p. 200.

[12] Davis, op. cit., pp. 81, 87-88.

This discussion leaves us with no recommendations to make concerning ways in which teacher education programs might be altered so as to produce more professional teachers.

Recruiting Future Teachers Selectively for Professional Predispositions

A third conceivable professionalizing strategy is selective recruitment into the occupation of the kinds of people who are predisposed to be professional. Our data showed far more relationship of professionalism to individual characteristics of teachers than to their preprofessional training experiences or on-the-job role-set relations. In the United States, only the armed forces are in the happy position of being able to draft people into service, but civilian occupations can sometimes pick and choose to at least some extent by offering special inducements to the kinds of people they want and concentrating recruitment campaigns among these groups. Unfortunately our findings indicate that in addition to the technical difficulties of special recruitment programs, recruiters of future teachers might have trouble in identifying which kinds of people they wanted to go after.

Negroes might be one such group. We have seen that the Negroes in our sample were more professional than the whites in some respects. (See Chapter IV, especially Table IV-8.) Negroes rated higher in knowledge orientation, orientation to autonomy and colleague group power, and professional behavior. However, they rated lower than whites in colleague reference group orientation, classroom teaching career commitment, and career and job satisfaction. This is an anomalous situation, and it raises a question which may be unpleasant but nevertheless deserves to be raised. Why did a group of people who did not especially like what they were doing, and who in many instances had chosen the work in the first place only because they saw no viable alternatives, spend so much time in reading about it and place so much stress on the importance of improving one's knowledge of it? Racial difference in the desire to fool the researcher by saying the nice-sounding thing can probably be ruled out as the explanation, since the Negroes did not hesitate to criticize all aspects of their role-set relations or to express dissatisfaction with teaching as a career and with their current jobs in particular.

It is possible that Negro teachers are simply more intellectually oriented than white teachers are. We left our discussion of the findings in Chapter IV with this as the implicitly assumed reason for the racial differences we found; but the assumption seems unsatisfactory. Negro teacher education graduates, on the average, make dismally low scores on such tests of knowledge as the National Teacher Examination. Negro teachers later in their careers continue to be outscored by whites. This suggests the hypothesis, which we cannot test because we obtained no data relevant to it, that the Negro teachers read more than whites because they knew less, and had to read a lot in order to keep up with their subjects. It is even conceivable that they read more slowly, and needed more time to read a given amount of material. Since they spent more time in reading than whites did, for whatever reason, it is only natural that they were more likely to say that teachers ought to spend large amounts of time in reading--i.e., in "improving themselves professionally," which was the wording of one of the knowledge orientation questions. Negroes' higher degree of agreement with the other knowledge orientation question, concerning the importance of advanced formal education for good teaching, may have reflected the fact that Negro teachers are a socially elite group in their subcommunities whereas white teachers are not. In a community where higher education is a relatively rare accomplishment, it is a status badge, and those who have it are likely to emphasize its importance.

If these untested hypotheses about the reasons for race differences in knowledge orientation and professional reading are correct, what is to be made of them? First, the differences probably are temporary and will grow smaller or disappear, along with racial differences in intelligence and knowledge, as Negroes move into the mainstream of the American occupational system. Ignorance and elite subcommunity status will both cease to be distinctive characteristics of Negro teachers when this happens, but so may their greater professionalism in the respects indicated. They will become little if any different from white teachers in outlook or behavior. Second, this process will not be accomplished overnight. In the short run, recruitment programs aimed at bringing more Negroes into teaching might increase the level of knowledge orientation and professional behavior in the occupation, but possibly at the cost of decreasing teachers' average level of actual knowledge of educational theory and the subjects they teach. The short-run effects of recruiting more Negro teachers might also include lowering the level of colleague reference group orientation and work satisfaction, since the whites in our sample were ahead of the Negroes in these respects.

Male teachers were another category distinguished by high levels of some aspects of professionalism. (Chapter IV, especially Table IV-8.) The men were less holistic in orientation, and more oriented to colleagues as an occupational reference group, than the women. This might suggest that more men should be recruited into teaching, an idea which is neither novel nor easily accomplished. Men tend to avoid teaching for at least two reasons. The salaries are lower than those which men of comparable educational attainment can earn in other lines of work; the beginning salaries are not much lower than beginning salaries in other fields, but the top of the salary scale is very low indeed. Another deterrent factor is the strongly held stereotype of teaching as a woman's occupation, which we examined in Chapter VI. The low salaries and the sex stereotype form a vicious circle: men avoid teaching because it is considered a feminine occupation, the salaries remain low partly because women can be hired on the cheap, and this gives men an added reason not to be teachers, so that teaching remains a woman's occupation--and so on. To bring teachers' salary levels up to the levels of income in other occupations available to male college graduates would require an enormous outlay of tax money, and even this might not do the job. To combat the sex stereotype of teaching, the salaries of teachers might have to be larger than the salaries in alternative occupations, or else most men might continue to prefer other occupations considered more masculine. It is probably a safe prophecy that increases in educational expenditures on the scale we are discussing will not happen any time soon.

Still another difficulty with the selective recruitment approach to teacher professionalization is that the same people who are most professional by one criterion are apt to be unprofessional by another. The concept of professionalism as we have used it in this research is essentially a unitary one, taken from the standard literature of sociology and with the various subcomponents of professionalism all stemming from its most essential component, the orientation to specialized knowledge and its application. But the dimensions appear not to hang together empirically. In Chapter III (Tables III-12 through III-17) we identified three clusters of professional attributes of teachers, two of them negatively related to each other and the third not related to either. In the first cluster were variables concerned with knowledge orientation, future career commitment, and the professional behaviors of reading, attending conferences, and consulting colleagues. The second cluster included variables concerned with orientation to autonomy and colleague group power, and absence of holistic orientation. All by itself was colleague reference group orientation. Thus if educators knew the necessary techniques to recruit people into the field, and had full information about the predispositions of different kinds of students to think and act in professional ways, they would still have to decide what kinds of professionalism they wanted, since to recruit people with an eye to maximizing either the first or the second cluster of professional attributes would reduce the prevalence of the attributes in the other cluster.

For these reasons, selective recruitment of teacher trainees seems unpromising as a way to professionalize the occupation. It might be impossible anyway, not only because little is known about how to attract people into a field when other academic disciplines and occupations are also in the competition, but also because the problem of recruitment may become increasingly one of getting enough teachers of any kind. The traditional recruitment sources for teachers may be drying up in the United States, for reasons dealt with in the next section.

Teacher Background and Recruitment[13]

Research has consistently shown that teachers come from a variety of social backgrounds, and that a substantial proportion of them have been upward mobile. The pattern of upward mobility into teaching is especially common among male teachers. Coffman, studying teachers in seventeen states in 1911, found that 70% of the men and 45% of the women had grown up on farms, 15% of the men and 28% of the women were from blue-collar backgrounds, and only 14% of the men and 25% of the women had white-collar fathers.[14] Of the teachers who reported fathers' occupations in a nationwide study conducted by Cook and Greenhoe in the late 1930's, 44% were from farm backgrounds, 21% from blue-collar backgrounds, and 35% from white-collar backgrounds.[15] Studying a national sample of beginning teachers in 1956, Mason found that 62% of the men and 49% of the women were from blue-collar or farm backgrounds. If we assume that clerical and sales workers, blue-collar workers, and farmers rank below teachers and other occupational groups are on a par with teachers or above them, 61% of Mason's beginning teachers had been upward mobile.[16] Other studies since World War II give results consistent with these.[17]

---

[13] I am indebted to Roger S. Sennott for performing much of the data processing and analysis and bibliographic work for this section, as a National Science Foundation undergraduate research participant. I have drawn extensively on his unpublished report of some of the findings.

[14] Lotus Delta Coffman, The Social Composition of the Teaching Population, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1911, p. 73. These percentages leave out a few who had grown up in fatherless families or did not report fathers' occupations.

[15] Lloyd A. Cook and Florence Greenhoe, "Community Contacts of 9,122 Teachers," Social Forces, 19 (1940), pp. 63-72. We have recalculated their percentages to make the 86% of their teachers who indicated fathers' occupations equal 100%. Their figures are not shown separately by sex.

This is not to say that many teachers have come from the very bottom of the social ladder. On the contrary, Carlson found that teachers' backgrounds somewhat overrepresented the upper half of the social class continuum and underrepresented the lower half.[18] The fathers of beginning teachers in Mason's sample were slightly above the national average in occupational status and educational attainment, and slightly more urban than the population as a whole.[19]

While the status origin of the typical teacher in these studies was higher than that of the average American, it was not much higher, and it was probably below that of the average college student. Certainly this must have been true in the period before World War I, when a high school diploma or a year or so at a "normal school" was all the education a public school teacher needed. It has clearly been the case in more recent years. Studies since World War II show that teachers have come from lower backgrounds than have medical students, college social science faculty members, independent attorneys, or dental students.[20] Higher percentages of education majors than of other college students studied by Davis were from rural and lower-class origins.[21]

---

[16] Ward S. Mason, The Beginning Teacher: Status and Career Orientations, OE-23009, Circular No. 644, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961, pp. 12-13. Backgrounds of elementary and secondary teachers differed very little.

[17] Richard O. Carlson, "Variations and Myth in the Social Status of Teachers," Journal of Educational Sociology, 35 (1951), pp. 104-118; William Wattenberg et al., "Social Origins of Teachers," in Lindley J. Stiles (ed.), The Teacher's Role in American Society, New York: Harper, 1957; National Education Association, The Status of the American Public-School Teacher, Washington: NEA, 1957; Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, Society and Education, 2nd ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957; John L. Colombotos, Sources of Professionalism: A Study of High School Teachers, Cooperative Research Project No. 330, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Department of Sociology, 1962.

[18] Carlson, op. cit.

[19] Mason, op. cit., pp. 11-18.

[20] Mason, op. cit., p. 13, gives these comparisons, based on data from Douglas M. More, "A Note on Occupational Origins of Health Service Professions," American Sociological Review, 25 (1960), p. 404; Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., The Academic Mind, New York: Free Press, 1958, p. 401; Stuart Adams, "Regional Differences in Vertical Mobility in a High-Status Occupation," American Sociological Review, 15 (1950), p. 231; Marvin Bressler and William M. Kephart, Career Dynamics, Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Nurses' Association, 1955, p. 116.

[21] James A. Davis, Great Aspirations, Chicago: Aldine, 1964.

Our findings are similar to these earlier ones, and they indicate something else which may be highly significant for the prospects of teacher recruitment. The social backgrounds of teachers have not been rising or becoming less agricultural as rapidly as the occupational distribution of the United States has been. The agricultural population of the United States has shrunk to about 6% of the labor force, though more people than this live on farms and have nonfarm jobs. The blue-collar population will continue to diminish as a percentage of the total population. These trends mean that any occupation which has continued to rely heavily on an agricultural recruiting base may already face recruiting problems, and any occupation which has drawn heavily on blue-collar recruits may eventually face personnel shortages. This is true for two reasons. The first is simply that there will be proportionately fewer people in these groups to draw from--and in the case of agriculture, there will be fewer in absolute numbers than in the past. The second is that people who wish to move upward from these groups will have an increasingly wide range of upward paths other than into teaching, as the variety of white-collar occupations continues to grow. As the child population increases while the reservoirs of potential teachers dry up, severe problems may lie ahead. The remainder of this chapter documents these trends and patterns as observed among the teachers in our sample.

Teachers' backgrounds. Table VII-1 gives a somewhat detailed breakdown of the occupations of fathers of North Carolina and metropolitan teachers by race and sex, and Table VII-2 gives a less detailed breakdown of the fathers' educational attainments. Both tables exclude teachers who said that no father was living with them when they were growing up, and the first table excludes those who did not give codable descriptions of their fathers' occupations. The occupational designations used in Table VII-1 are described in Appendix E, with illustrative occupations which were a part of the coding instructions.

Table VII-1 indicates that 41% of the teachers had white-collar fathers--those shown in the first five rows combined--but this figure varied enormously from one subcategory to another, ranging from 17% and 18% of the metropolitan and North Carolina Negro male teachers at one extreme to 70% of the metropolitan white women at the other extreme. A rough estimate of how many teachers had been intergenerationally upward mobile is possible, given certain assumptions: that all business proprietors and executives were equal to teachers or above in status, and that all of the "other white collar," blue-collar, and agricultural fathers rated lower than teachers. None of these assumptions is completely true. Agriculture and business are especially tricky categories to deal with, since men under these headings could theoretically span the continuum from large plantation owners and captains of industry to sharecroppers and self-employed peanut vendors. Assuming that most men engaged in agriculture rate

TABLE VII-1. OCCUPATIONS OF TEACHERS' FATHERS, BY TEACHERS' STATE, RACE, AND SEX

Teachers' State, Race, and Sex (N)	Higher Professional	Teacher or Principal	Other Semi-Professional	Proprietor or Executive	Other White Collar	Skilled Blue Collar	Lower Blue Collar or Service	Agriculture	White Collar as % of Nonagriculture
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
North Carolina:									
White men (1190)	3	3	5	14	9	16	15	35	52
White women (5497)	5	3	6	23	10	10	7	36	73
Negro men (289)	1	3	6	5	3	15	34	33	27
Negro women (1014)	2	4	9	5	3	15	29	33	34
Metropolitan:									
White men (86)	7	3	5	16	17	23	21	7	52
White women (288)	11	2	8	31	18	16	10	5	73
Negro men (92)	4	3	4	2	4	14	63	4	18
Negro women (276)	4	3	5	7	8	23	47	4	28
All teachers (8958)*	4	3	6	19	9	12	14	33	61

* N for all teachers exceeds combined N's for the subcategories shown because it includes 226 teachers in federally operated schools for Indians and children of military personnel, for whom we lack data on race of teachers.

below teachers is probably safe enough for purposes of rough aggregative estimates, especially in the South and especially among Negro southerners. The assumption that business proprietors and executives equal or exceed teachers in status is less safe, but nonfarm business proprietors were not a large percentage of the total, and the coding procedure distinguished salaried administrators from employees whose duties were essentially clerical, the latter being defined as "other white collar" rather than as executives. Granting the indicated assumptions, and defining any teacher whose father was in the other white collar, blue collar, or agricultural category as upward mobile, 68% of our teachers had been upward mobile, with a range from 49% of metropolitan white women to 85% of the Negro men in both states.

Not surprisingly, whites had come from substantially higher social backgrounds than Negroes. The race difference was greater among metropolitan than among North Carolina teachers, and greater among women than among men.

Women were from higher backgrounds than men, a finding which parallels those of previous studies we have cited. Proportionately more women than men had white-collar fathers; fewer women had been upward mobile; and among the blue-collar fathers, the fathers of women were more likely than the fathers of men to be in the skilled category. These sex differences in teachers' backgrounds were more pronounced in North Carolina than in the metropolis.

White teachers were more likely to have white-collar fathers in North Carolina than in the metropolis; but among Negroes, white-collar backgrounds were about equally prevalent in both states. Both white and Negro teachers of both sexes included higher percentages with blue-collar fathers in the metropolis than in North Carolina; this difference was particularly marked among Negroes, over 70% of whom in the metropolis were from blue-collar backgrounds.

There was little or no race or sex difference in the prevalence of agricultural backgrounds, but in this respect North Carolina greatly exceeded the metropolis. (Over half the metropolitan teachers were natives of the metropolitan area where they were teaching.) For this reason, perhaps the best way to compare directly the backgrounds of metropolitan and North Carolina teachers with a view to guessing about future trends is to remove those with agricultural fathers from the sample and calculate the percentages of nonagricultural fathers who were in white-collar occupations. This procedure is also helpful in comparing white and Negro backgrounds, since nonagricultural occupational categories of whites and Negroes are more nearly comparable than the agricultural one is; in comparison with Negro farmers, the white farmers were far more likely to be relatively prosperous owners or owner-renters rather than sharecroppers or laborers. White-collar backgrounds as percentages of all nonagricultural ones are shown in the right-hand column of Table VII-1. By this measure the metropolitan white male and female teachers were identical to these of the same sex in North Carolina but the metropolitan Negroes were from somewhat lower backgrounds than the North Carolina Negroes were.

Table VII-2 shows educational attainments of fathers of the various categories of teachers. It indicates the same general pattern of differences as the previous table, and in this case the data on metropolitan and North Carolina teachers are more directly comparable because the distoring effect of the high proportion of farmers in North Carolina is not present; educational backgrounds can be directly compared.

The percentages of fathers who were high school and college graduates is not surprisingly low when it is remembered that the average teacher was about 40 years old in 1962, so that the average father was probably born in the 1890's. Many of the fathers grew up in places which had no schools beyond the eighth grade at the time. Be this as it may, the teachers had been overwhelmingly upward mobile by the educational criterion whereas scarcely more than two-thirds of them had been upward mobile by the occupational criterion. This has, of course, been true of the general population. The American educational distribution has risen faster than the occupational distribution, and many occupations now require more education than they once did, including teaching itself. Not until well into the twentieth century did teaching in most of the South require a college degree, and many areas outside the South were not far ahead of it in this respect.

As the data on fathers' occupations also showed, women were from higher backgrounds than men. The sex difference is barely apparent among North Carolina Negroes in the figures shown in the table, but more detailed figures (not shown) indicate that it was clearly present among them, as among other teachers. Of the North Carolina Negroes whose fathers were in the middle educational category listed in the table, a higher percentage of women's than of men's fathers had done some college work and of those in the bottom category, fathers of women were more likely than fathers of men to have had some high school education.

The two states differed very little in educational attainments of teachers' fathers. Metropolitan white men were more likely than North Carolina white men to have fathers who had graduated from college; the reverse was true of Negro men in the two states; but other than this, the educational backgrounds of separate race-sex categories in the two states were all but identical.

Some comments on the racial differences may be in order. The races differed more in fathers' occupations (Table VII-1) than in fathers' educational attainments. Indeed, the education of Negro women's fathers was not greatly different from that of white men's fathers, whereas the

TABLE VII-2. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENTS OF TEACHERS' FATHERS, BY TEACHERS' STATE, RACE, AND SEX

Teachers' State, Race, and Sex (N)	College Graduate %	High School Graduate but Not College Graduate %	Not High School Graduate %
North Carolina:			
White men (1228)	9	25	66
White women (5622)	13	34	53
Negro men (300)	8	16	76
Negro women (1061)	9	17	73
Metropolitan:			
White men (94)	15	20	65
White women (309)	13	34	53
Negro men (98)	4	20	75
Negro women (310)	8	25	67
All teachers (9261)*	12	29	59

* N for all teachers exceeds combined N's for the subcategories shown because it includes 239 teachers in federally operated schools for Indians and children of military personnel, for whom we lack data on race of teachers.

occupational background differences between these two groups of teachers were large. This situation reflects the well known fact that if a Negro and a white person have had the same number of years of schooling, the white stands the better chance of having a good job, both because of discrimination in hiring and because the actual quality of education received by Negroes and whites in a given number of years is not usually the same.

The occupational and educational background comparisons of metropolitan teachers with teachers in North Carolina, one of the nation's most rural states, suggest that urbanization does not alter the fact that teacing draws a large percentage of its recruits from working-class backgrounds, except among white women, many of whom teach only temporarily or intermittenly. In the modern city as in the smaller communities of the past, teaching remains a channel of upward mobility for many people. As fewer and fewer teachers can come from farms, the vacuum is filled by people from blue-collar rather than white-collar origins. Data to be given later on origins of young and old teachers point to this same conclusion.[22]

Backgrounds of teachers of different subjects. Table VII-3, on father's occupational status among teachers of different subjects, reveals some patterns which have implications for future teacher recruitment. The tabulations were done only for North Carolina teachers because the N's of metropolitan teachers were too small to analyze them separately with any confidence, and to have mixed them in with North Carolina teachers would have had little effect on the resulting percentages and might have muddied the waters somewhat.

---

22. A lengthy series of tables not given in this report indicates that within North Carolina, big-city teachers were from higher backgrounds than were small-town or rural teachers. Teachers in the larger North Carolina cities were, in fact, more likely to be from white-collar backgrounds and much less likely to be from blue-collar backgrounds than were teachers in the larger metropolis in a different state, and the fathers of North Carolina city teachers were more educated than those of metropolitan teachers. These differences were the result, however, of the superior attractiveness of city schools to teachers from high social backgrounds, regardless of where they had grown up, not the result of higher status backgrounds of teachers who had grown up in the cities. The metropolis we studied produced most of its own teachers, but the North Carolina teacher labor market was statewide, with the biggest cities tending to attract more than their share of teachers from high social backgrounds who had attended the highest-prestige colleges and universities throughout the state and in surrounding states. This means that small-scale urbanization such as North Carolina's does not produce teachers with high-status backgrounds, but simply drains such teachers away from the rural areas.

TABLE VII-3. OCCUPATIONS OF NORTH CAROLINA TEACHERS' FATHERS, BY TEACHERS' RACE, SEX, AND SUBJECT TAUGHT

Race, Sex, and Subject Taught (N)	White Collar %	Blue Collar %	Agriculture %
White men:			
Elementary (115)	33	22	45
Music, art, foreign language, English (160)	42	31	26
Social studies (150)	34	37	29
Mathematics, science (313)	32	31	37
Physical education (94)	39	39	21
Shop, commercial studies, vocational agriculture (175)	21	22	58
White women:			
Elementary (3438)	44	17	40
Music, art, foreign language, English (739)	59	19	22
Social studies (145)	54	20	26
Mathematics, science (425)	48	16	35
Physical education (49)	51	31	18
Home economics, commercial studies (331)	41	16	42
Negro men:			
Elementary (63)	17	44	38
Music, art, foreign language, English (26)	31	58	12
Social studies (26)	23	54	23
Mathematics, science (78)	14	56	29
Physical education (8)	38	38	25
Shop, commercial studies, vocational agriculture (43)	14	33	53
Negro women:			
Elementary (688)	23	42	35
Music, art, foreign language, English (104)	32	44	24
Social studies (32)	28	50	22
Mathematics, science (54)	24	41	35
Physical education (11)	9	73	18
Home economics, commercial studies (47)	13	55	32

As has been discussed earlier, any occupational group which has depended heavily on farmers' sons and daughters to fill its ranks is likely to be having severe recruitment problems already, and any occupation dependent on recruits from the blue-collar classes may have similar problems in the coming decades. Table VII-3 shows that the teaching specialties which had relied most strongly on recruitment from the farm were elementary teaching, mathematics and science, and the last-listed category of home economics, commercial studies, shop, and (not surprisingly) vocational agriculture.[23] From this we would predict problems in staffing these fields.

English and the other humanities had the highest percentages of teachers from white-collar origins, and had depended less than other subjects on recruits from agricultural backgrounds. From this it can be predicted that these fields will have the fewest difficulties in attracting teachers, for they have drawn more than other secondary school fields from the fastest-growing segment of the population and less than other fields from the declining agricultural sector. On the other hand, the kinds of people who teach the humanities--women, and these mainly from white-collar backgrounds-- are the most prone to drop out of teaching after a few years.

Social studies and physical education had not been heavily dependent on recruiting the children of farmers, but rather high percentages of their nonagricultural recruits were from blue-collar backgrounds. This being the case, the shift out of agriculture might benefit these fields in the short run, as the teacher recruitment base becomes more blue-collar; but in the long run there might be difficulties for such fields as the white-collar segment of the population grows and the blue-collar segment shrinks as a proportion of the total. Our guess, not testable with any data at our disposal, is that the social studies are more likely to have recruiting problems in the future than physical education is. There are

---

23. Our finding of the frequently agricultural origins of mathematics and science teachers parallels Knapp and Goodrich's finding that an unexpectedly high proportion of American scientists had grown up in midwestern rural and semirural communities. Rossi has suggested a reason: scientific work requires the habit of solitary cogitation and the emotional readiness to work long hours alone, and the isolation of childhood on a farm helps to instill these qualities. See R. H. Knapp and H. B. Goodrich, Origins of American Scientists, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952; Alice S. Rossi, "Barriers to the Career Choice of Engineering, Medicine or Science among American Women," in Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld and Carol G. Van Aken (eds.), Women and the Scientific Professions, Cambridge, Mass. and London, England: M.I.T. Press, 1965, pp. 51-127. Rossi's discussion of this point is on pp. 121-124.

numerous occupations which can satisfy the values which social studies teachers tend to have, but a person who wants to spend his life being an athlete can do it in only one way, teaching in the schools, unless he is one of the rare individuals with enough talent to be a professional athlete. For this reason it seems probable that the reason why low percentages of physical education teachers were from farms was not that the field repelled rural people, but that it did not repel urbanites as much as other teaching fields did. If this interpretation is correct, there should always be a supply of good but not outstanding athletes to teach physical education in the schools.

It is of interest to note that the ranking of agricultural and white-collar recruitment into the three "academic" high school subjects--humanities, social studies, mathematics and science--parallelled their ranking in the sex stereotypes reported earlier. Mathematics and science, the most masculine of the academic fields, were the most agricultural and least white-collar in their recruitment sources; humanities, the most feminine fields, were the most white-collar and least agricultural in recruitment; and social studies, the sexually neutral field, was intermediate in both respects. This reinforces the prediction that mathematics and science will have the most serious recruitment problems and humanities the least, on the assumption that it may become harder rather than easier to get men into teaching as the alternatives open to upward mobile men become more varied.

Table VII-4 compares the percentages of North Carolina teachers and college student education majors who were teaching or preparing to teach different fields. It allows a test of some of the predictions made on the basis of the backgrounds of teachers of different subjects, by seeing whether the predicted shortages of teachers in some fields were evident in low percentages of students preparing to teach these subjects. Most of the predictions fare well.

From Table VII-3 we predicted immediate teacher shortages in the fields which had drawn disproportionately from agricultural backgrounds in the past. These fields were elementary teaching, mathematics and science, and the residual category which included home economics, shop, commercial studies, and vocational agriculture.

Comparing the percentages of teachers who were in elementary schools with the percentages of students who wanted to teach at the elementary level, we find the percentage lower among the students, as predicted, except among Negro men; but for reasons to be discussed later, the Negro male exception may be more apparent than real, and Negro male elementary teachers, like other elementary teachers, may have become harder to recruit.

The choice of science and mathematics teaching had dropped off sharply from the teachers' to the students' generation in both male groups,

TABLE VII-4. PERCENTAGES OF NORTH CAROLINA TEACHERS AND STUDENTS TEACHING OR PREPARING TO TEACH DIFFERENT SUBJECTS, BY RACE AND SEX

Race, Sex, and Subject	Teachers %	Students %
White men:		
Elementary	12	3
Humanities	15	15
Social studies	15	16
Mathematics, science	31	22
Physical education	9	27
Other	17	16
(N)	(1036)	(279)
White women:		
Elementary	67	42
Humanities	15	21
Social studies	3	9
Mathematics, science	8	6
Physical education	1	5
Other	7	18
(N)	(5246)	([illegible]68)
Negro men:		
Elementary	27	32
Humanities	11	10
Social studies	10	19
Mathematics, science	31	15
Physical education	4	7
Other	17	16
(N)	(249)	(68)
Negro women:		
Elementary	74	44
Humanities	11	14
Social studies	3	6
Mathematics, science	6	6
Physical education	1	4
Other	5	26
(N)	(974)	(239)

but not among women. The drop was from 31% of white male teachers to 22% of white male students, and from 31% of Negro male teachers to 15% of Negro male students. Another way of looking at the decline in attractiveness of science and mathematics teaching to men is to observe that male mathematics and science teachers, both Negro and white, outnumbered male humanities and social studies teachers combined, but among both the Negro and white students, those preparing for humanities or social studies teaching considerably outnumbered those preparing for mathematics and science teaching.

The expectation of a dropoff in the "other" category was not met. Instead, among women, there had been a substantial increase in choice of these fields from the teachers' to the students' generation; but among women, the teachers in this category were not much more agricultural in background than the rest of the teachers. Among the men, our prediction was a sharp decline in choice of "other" teaching fields, and instead there had been essentially no change: a meaningless drop from 17% of teachers to 16% of students, both white and Negro. We did not code the data on either teachers or students in a way that enables us to isolate specific subject fields within the "other" category, and the distribution of specific fields among the teachers and the students may be quite different. One difficulty of interpretation is due to the fact that full-time counselors and other non-classroom school personnel were excluded from the teacher sample, and the students who were preparing for these fields, some of which are growing rapidly, were included in the "other" category. Therefore we cannot be sure of what these figures on teachers and students in the "other" subject category mean. One possibility is that there is much more student demand for these subjects now than in the past, hence more recruitment of teachers of them, since they include vocational training subjects often taken by the kinds of people who formerly did not finish high school.

It was predicted from the findings on teacher background that social studies and physical education might have recruiting troubles in the future, but not immediately, since these fields had relied rather heavily on blue-collar recruits. Both of these subjects were more strongly represented among the students than among the teachers; this was to be expected, since the shift of teacher backgrounds has been mainly away from agricultural and toward blue-collar origins. Such a finding cannot test our prediction about recruitment into these fields in future decades, but it adds substance to the reasoning which led to the prediction.

If one inspects the N's in these tables and in others, it is evident that men constituted a higher percentage of college student education majors than of teachers, among whites, and about the same percentage among Negroes. Does this mean that teaching has become more attractive to men than it once was? No, it does not. What these sex distributions reflect is the fact that a far larger percentage of men than of women, in the cohorts of beginning teachers of whom the teachers in our sample were the residue, had moved out of the classroom into administrative work. I.e., of all the teachers who began their educational careers when our teachers were beginning theirs, a larger percentage was probably male than in our sample of teachers, for our sample includes only those who had not left the classroom. (We are assuming that the men were more likely to have become principals than the women were to have stopped working and not returned.) Thus our figures actually suggest that a smaller percentage of Negro college student education majors was male than had been true in past college generations, despite the seemingly contrary indication in the table.

Another factor which probably affected the comparative sex composition of the various fields is the greater likelihood that a male elementary teacher will become a principal than that a male secondary teacher will become one. Given the stereotypes favoring men over women as principals, and the rarity of men in elementary teaching, male elementary teachers presumably face less competition for principalships than male secondary teachers do.[24] If so, the appeal of elementary teaching to white men had probably dropped even more than our figures show, and the relative appeal of elementary as opposed to secondary teaching may have gone down rather than up among Negroes. The assumption behind these speculations is that the beginning cohorts of the male elementary teachers in our sample had been more depleted by promotions into administration than had the beginning cohorts of secondary teachers, so that the figures on teachers underestimate the number of men in the beginning cohorts who had taught in elementary schools.

Backgrounds of young and old teachers. The next two tables, which examine occupational status origins of young and old teachers, show quite clearly that there had been a shift away from agricultural origins but into blue-collar rather than white-collar origins, at a time when the proportion of the total labor force made up of white-collar workers was increasing. Table VII-5 shows that the young teachers had not come from higher social origins than the old. The percentage of nonagricultural fathers who were white-collar rather than blue-collar was, in fact, higher among teachers over 40 than among teachers under 40, in all categories of teachers, except, again, the metropolitan white women.

---

[24] A 1955-1956 survey found that about half the principals of elementary schools were women, but only 9% of junior high school principals and 5% of senior high school principals were women. But this does not mean that it was easier for a given male secondary teacher than for a given male elementary teacher to become a principal, since the male elementary school principals were drawn from a much smaller pool of potential principals. See Women's Bureau, 1962 Handbook on Women Workers, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 19.

TABLE VII-5. OCCUPATIONS OF TEACHERS' FATHERS, BY TEACHERS' STATE, RACE, SEX, AND AGE

State, Race, Sex, and Age (N)	White Collar %	Blue Collar %	Agri-culture %	White Collar as % of Nonagri-culture
North Carolina:				
White men:				
39 and younger (867)	34	36	30	49
40 and older (323)	32	17	51	65
White women:				
39 and younger (2359)	49	23	27	68
40 and older (3124)	44	13	44	77
Negro men:				
39 and younger (174)	15	50	35	23
40 and older (114)	24	46	31	34
Negro women:				
39 and younger (463)	16	47	36	25
40 and older (547)	28	41	31	41
Total North Carolina:				
39 and younger (3878)*	40	30	29	57
40 and older (4130)*	40	18	42	69
Metropolitan:				
White men:				
39 and younger (51)	51	49	0	51
40 and older (35)	46	37	17	55
White women:				
39 and younger (150)	73	23	3	76
40 and older (137)	65	28	7	70
Negro men:				
39 and younger (65)	15	80	5	16
40 and older (27)	26	70	4	27
Negro women:				
39 and younger (201)	24	73	3	25
40 and older (72)	35	60	6	37
Total metropolitan:				
39 and younger (467)	42	55	3	43
40 and older (271)	50	42	8	54

*Total North Carolina N's exceed N's for combined subcategories shown because the state totals include teachers in federally operated schools for whom data on race were unavailable.

In 1930, the census year which best represents the time when the average older teacher in our sample was growing up, 50% of the men in North Carolina were farmers or farm managers; 42% of our older teachers reported that their fathers were in agriculture.[25] By 1950, the best census year to examine the occupational composition of the state when our average younger teacher was growing up, the percentage of North Carolina men who were farmers or farm managers was down sharply from 1930, to 21%, but 29% of the younger teachers were from farms.[26] To state the matter differently, while the percentage of farmers and farm managers in the North Carolina male labor force was dropping from 50% to 21%, the percentage of teachers with agricultural backgrounds was dropping only from 42% to 29%. These comparisons suggest that while farm origins were very common among our older teachers, they were not overrepresented among them; but by the time our younger teachers were entering the occupation, farm backgrounds had become overrepresented among them or were moving in that direction.[27]

The shift out of agriculture does not greatly matter in the metropolis, and presumably not in other metropolitan areas, since there were not many farmers' children among the teachers there in the old days either. In North Carolina, the shift was evident only among the whites and was reversed among the Negroes; among North Carolina Negroes of both sexes, somewhat higher percentages of young than of old teachers were the sons and daughters of men engaged in agriculture. The reason for this is probably that in times past, southern Negro agriculturists were mainly sharecroppers and laborers in such a severe state of social deprivation that they could not get the education needed to become teachers. Life among rural Negroes in the South today could hardly be mistaken for paradise, but it has improved enough so that substantial numbers of rural Negroes can get out of it into occupations like teaching. It is to be expected that in the future, southern Negroes will reach the point which whites have already reached, with not many agricultural workers of any description, easier entry of white-collar workers' children into occupations more attractive than teaching, and therefore a growing reliance on the blue-collar stratum for the recruitment of teachers. When Negroes catch up with whites by becoming predominantly white-collar, it will then become difficult to recruit Negroes into teaching, but it may be a long time before this happens. In other words, changes in the patterns of Negro teacher recruitment will parallel the changes taking place among whites, after a time lag.

---

[25] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Fifteenth Census of the U.S.: 1930, Population, Vol. IV, Occupations by State, p. 1201.

[26] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Part I, United States Summary, p. I-129.

[27] It is hard to say at exactly what point they would become overrepresented, because it is hard to say exactly what census categories of agricultural work should be counted in estimating their proper, or chance, representation. An exact estimate is not necessary for our purpose, but to make one would require a decision to include or exclude the sizable category of "unpaid family labor." This category doubtless includes people who ought to be included, but it also includes 14-year-old boys working only temporarily in agriculture.

To sum up the meaning of Table VII-5: Teaching increasingly relies on recruits from a shrinking base, blue-collar workers, and continues to rely on a base which has shrunk to very small proportions, agriculture. As teachers become increasingly blue-collar in origin, a growing percentage of them will be Negroes. Eventually, when Negroes catch up with whites in occupational composition and when most Americans are in white-collar or highly skilled blue-collar work with easy access to higher education and a variety of high-status occupations to choose from, it may be very hard to find enough schoolteachers.

Table VII-6 classifies teachers by more detailed age groups and leads to similar conclusions. One way to look at the table is simply to observe the percentages of teachers of different ages whose fathers were in white-collar occupations. Doing this, we see the very youngest in North Carolina rating above the rest, but little difference among other North Carolina age groups. Among the metropolitan teachers there was a curvilinear pattern with teachers in their thirties having the smallest percentage of white-collar fathers. In neither state were the younger teachers from higher backgrounds than the older teachers, as might have been expected on the basis of demographic changes in American society.

The more meaningful thing to look at, especially with future teacher recruitment in mind, is the percentage of nonagricultural fathers who were in white-collar work. By this criterion the curvilinear pattern was plainly evident in North Carolina as well as in the metropolis. The reason for the decline of white-collar backgrounds in the late twenties and thirties, followed by the rise in the forties and later ages, is that women of high-status backgrounds tend to marry high-status men, and are therefore more able to stop work during the child-rearing years than are women who are less privileged. Many of them then return to

TABLE VII-6. OCCUPATIONS OF TEACHERS' FATHERS, BY TEACHERS' STATE AND DETAILED AGE

State and Age (N)	White Collar %	Blue Collar %	Agriculture %	White Collar as % of Nonagriculture
North Carolina:				
24 and younger (828)	50	26	24	66
25-29 (1253)	42	32	26	57
30-39 (1797)	36	31	34	54
40-49 (1822)	41	21	38	66
50 and older (2308)	39	15	46	72
Metropolitan:				
24 and younger (124)	48	49	3	49
25-29 (152)	42	54	5	44
30-39 (191)	37	61	2	38
40-49 (144)	44	49	7	47
50 and older (128)	58	34	9	63

work when the children leave home, and their return is reflected in the figures on backgrounds of older teachers.[28]

In both states, the oldest teachers had come from backgrounds as high as or higher than the youngest; which of these extreme age categories rated higher depends, in North Carolina, on which measure of status is used, the one including or not including agricultural fathers. Very likely the women in the oldest age cohorts who had the highest-status husbands, and who can therefore be presumed to have had the highest average backgrounds, were more likely than those of lower backgrounds and husbands' statuses to have left teaching during the child-bearing ages and never come back. If we can make this assumption, which seems a reasonable one, this means that the backgrounds of all beginning teachers at the time when those in the oldest cohorts began were higher, on the average, than the backgrounds of those who kept on teaching or came back after leaving. If so, the backgrounds of the oldest cohort of beginning teacher were higher than those shown in the table, and the difference between the oldest and youngest would be more pronounced than the difference shown in the table if we had data on teachers who had stopped work and not returned. This is another indication that teaching may have decreasing appeal to people from white-collar backgrounds, and may have to rely increasingly on the proportionately shrinking blue-collar group for recruits.

Some comparisons with other studies. Table VII-7 suggests that our findings are representative of the situation which has prevailed nationally. Family backgrounds of our first-year teachers were almost identical to those of first-year teachers in a national sample studied six years earlier by Mason.[29] Our findings on young and old teachers' backgrounds are similar to comparable findings by Havighurst and Neugarten, who studied Detroit teachers a few years before our data were gathered.[30] The data on our statewide sample of North Carolina teachers and on our metropolitan teachers, and theirs on Detroit teachers, all show shifts away from farm backgrounds, toward blue-collar rather than white-collar backgrounds, and corresponding declines in white-collar backgrounds as percentages of all nonagricultural backgrounds.

---

[28] For a general discussion of this phenomenon in several semi-professional occupations, see Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, "Women and Bureaucracy in the Semi-Professions," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, New York: Free Press, 1969, pp. 207-215.

[29] Mason, op. cit.

[30] Havighurst and Neugarten, op. cit., p. 360.

TABLE VII-7. COMPARISON OF FINDINGS WITH FINDINGS OF EARLIER STUDIES OF FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS OF FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS AND OF TEACHERS UNDER AND OVER FORTY YEARS OLD

Category of Teachers and Study (N)	White Collar %	Blue Collar %	Agri-culture %	White Collar as % of Nonagriculture
First-year teachers:				
Simpson, two southern states, 1962 data (592)	46	34	20	58
Mason, national sample, 1956 data (7150)	46	37	18	55
Teachers 39 and younger vs. 40 and older:				
Simpson, North Carolina, 1962 data:				
39 and younger (3878)	40	30	29	57
40 and older (4130)	40	18	42	69
Simpson, metropolitan, 1962 data:				
39 and younger (467)	42	55	3	43
40 and older (271)	50	42	8	54
Havighurst and Neugarten, Detroit, 1950's data:				
39 and younger (137)	43	55	2	44
40 and older (34)	50	26	24	66

Sources of data from earlier studies: Figures for Mason's study of beginning teachers are our calculations from percentages and N's which he reports for men and women teachers separately, in Ward S. Mason, The Beginning Teacher: Status and Career Orientations, OE-23009, Circular No. 644, Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 13. Figures for the Detroit study are our calculations from percentages and N's reported in Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, Society and Education, 2nd ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957, p. 360. It was necessary to recalculate Havighurst and Neugarten's data to remove from their sample the teachers whose fathers were described as "unemployed, retired, or deceased," for comparability with our findings. The data from the three studies are still not wholly comparable, since we asked about father's occupation "while you were growing up" and the other studies simply asked father's occupation.

Backgrounds of college students with different career plans. The next four tables compare backgrounds of the college students in our sample who were majoring in education and other subjects, and, among the education majors, those who were planning and not planning continuous lifelong careers in education. The findings indicate a continuance of the trends observed among the teachers.

Table VII-8 shows that education students came from lower occupational and educational status backgrounds than non-education students, and from smaller communities. A comparison of the occupational origins of these education students with the occupational origins of teachers reported earlier indicates a steep decline in agricultural backgrounds, a substantial increase in blue-collar backgrounds, and only a small increase in white-collar backgrounds.

Table VII-9 compares the occupations of fathers of education majors who planned continuous careers in the field, education majors who did not plan continuous careers, and students not majoring in education. The pattern of differences in white-collar and blue-collar backgrounds is very clear. Education career planners were the most blue-collar and least white-collar in background, non-education majors were the most white-collar and least blue-collar, and education non-career planners were in between. To put the matter more simply, non-education majors had the highest-status backgrounds and education career planners the lowest. In agricultural backgrounds, the three groups of whites (both male and female) hardly differed, and the patterns among Negroes were inconsistent. The only reversal of the prevailing pattern of differences in white-collar and blue-collar origins involved Negro women education majors planning vs. not planning continuous careers. The white collar-blue collar pattern was strongest among white men; white men majoring in subjects other than education had about the same background distribution as white women non-education majors, but of the white students in education, women tended to come from considerably higher backgrounds than men, especially among the career planners.

Table VII-10, on fathers' education of the same three categories of college students, reveals essentially the same patterns as the previous table on their fathers' occupations, though with somewhat less consistency. Only among white women--who of course constitute the largest number of teachers--did the pattern of highest backgrounds among non-education majors and lowest backgrounds among education career planners obtain. Among white men and Negro women, education students were of lower status origins than other students, but the

TABLE VII-8. FATHER'S OCCUPATION, FATHER'S EDUCATION, AND COMMUNITY ORIGIN OF STUDENT EDUCATION AND NON-EDUCATION MAJORS

	Education Majors %	Non-Education Majors %
Father's occupation:		
White collar	46	60
Blue collar	39	29
Agriculture	15	11
(N)	(965)	(1468)
White collar as % of nonagriculture	54	67
Father's education:		
College graduate	17	28
High school graduate	43	41
Not high school graduate	40	31
(N)	(1237)	(1799)
Community origin:		
Rural	42	31
Town	39	39
City or metropolitan	19	29
(N)	(1239)	(1797)

TABLE VII-9. FATHER'S OCCUPATION OF STUDENT EDUCATION CAREER PLANNERS, EDUCATION NON-CAREER PLANNERS, AND NON-EDUCATION MAJORS, BY RACE AND SEX

Race, Sex, and Career Planning Category (N)	White Collar %	Blue Collar %	Agri-culture %	White Collar as % of Nonagri-culture
White men:				
Education career planners (114)	39	47	14	45
Education non-career planners (90)	51	38	11	57
Non-education majors (947)	63	26	11	71
White women:				
Education career planners (137)	54	34	12	61
Education non-career planners (407)	62	27	11	70
Non-education majors (392)	66	25	10	73
Negro men:				
Education career planners (25)	8	72	20	10
Education non-career planners (19)	11	47	42	19
Non-education majors (32)	16	59	25	21
Negro women:				
Education career planners (66)	18	59	23	23
Education non-career planners (107)	15	57	29	21
Non-education majors (97)	25	58	18	30

TABLE VII-10. FATHER'S EDUCATION OF STUDENT EDUCATION CAREER PLANNERS, EDUCATION NON-CAREER PLANNERS, AND NON-EDUCATION MAJORS, BY RACE AND SEX

Race, Sex, and Career Planning Category (N)	College Graduate %	High School Graduate %	Not High School Graduate %
White men:			
Education career planners (155)	17	42	41
Education non-career planners (120)	14	50	36
Non-education majors (1135)	28	42	30
White women:			
Education career planners (169)	17	44	39
Education non-career planners (496)	25	50	25
Non-education majors (484)	34	44	22
Negro men:			
Education career planners (34)	6	29	65
Education non-career planners (27)	4	37	59
Non-education majors (49)	6	29	65
Negro women:			
Education career planners (85)	6	33	61
Education non-career planners (151)	7	25	68
Non-education majors (131)	17	30	53

career planning and non-career planning education students were similar to each other in backgrounds. No particular pattern of any sort existed among Negro men.[31]

Table VII-11 examines community origins. Both the career planning and non-career planning education majors in all four race-sex categories were more likely to be from rural communities than the students in other fields were. (Compare Table VII-8, which did not distinguish race and sex categories or the career planning categories of education majors.) Beyond this, the rankings of the three categories of students were not completely consistent in all race-sex categories, but they tended in general to show education students coming from smaller communities than other students. The education majors as a whole were less likely than others students to have grown up in big cities, except among Negro men. However, among education majors, the community origins of career planners and non-career planners did not differ in a consistent way in all four race-sex categories. The career planners were more rural among whites but less rural among Negroes. Career planners were less likely than non-career planners to be from big cities among white and Negro women, but less so among men.

All in all, the data in Tables VII-8 through VII-11 are in line with the findings on teachers, though with some exceptions as noted in the discussion above. Students preparing to teach were from lower-status and more rural backgrounds than non-education majors--or, to put it differently, a student from a rural or low-status background was more likely to choose education as his field of study than a student from a city or a high-status background was. Of the education students, those planning lifelong careers in the field were from lower social origins than the non-career planners when status was measured by father's occupation, but the career planners and non-career planners did not differ consistently in father's education or community origin.

---

31. The fact that father's occupation and father's education as indicators of status origins produced somewhat different results in our last two tables may provide food for methodological thought. Though the general drift of our findings is not significantly affected by the differences, they show that indicators of a phenomenon--in this case, social status--may not always be as interchangeable as they might seem. Education and occupational level are strongly related to each other but in this instance they are somewhat differently related to a third variable, the career plans of students. For an analysis of how the choice of indicator and analysis technique can have effects on the kind of theory which emerges from a set of data or potential data, see Lewis F. Carter, "Inadvertent Sociological Theory," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, New Orleans, April 1969.

TABLE VII-11. COMMUNITY ORIGINS OF STUDENT EDUCATION CAREER PLANNERS, EDUCATION NON-CAREER PLANNERS, AND NON-EDUCATION MAJORS, BY RACE AND SEX

Race, Sex, and Career Planning Category (N)	Rural %	Town %	City or Metropolitan %
White men:			
Education career planners (155)	42	35	23
Education non-career planners (120)	37	47	17
Non-education majors (1135)	32	39	30
White women:			
Education career planners (168)	46	39	14
Education non-career planners (495)	38	39	23
Non-education majors (481)	30	40	30
Negro men:			
Education career planners (36)	42	31	28
Education non-career planners (27)	48	37	15
Non-education majors (48)	29	50	21
Negro women:			
Education career planners (87)	44	46	10
Education non-career planners (151)	50	36	14
Non-education majors (133)	37	36	27

Backgrounds of students with different career plans at elite and non-elite colleges. Some of the background differences between education and non-education students may have been due to the fact that students from working-class origins were more likely to be attending teachers' colleges or other low-status institutions where teacher preparation was the most visible part of the curriculum. Some of these students might have chosen different fields of study if they had attended different colleges, since most entering freshmen do not know what their major subjects will be, and their choices are influenced by what the curriculum offers and what other students are doing. If differing social origins of students in different kinds of colleges had helped to create the career choice patterns we have observed, deliberate social policies aimed at bringing more students from low social origins into high-status colleges might alter the patterns. For example, the current efforts to bring more black students into white colleges might have such an effect. Broadening the curricula of the institutions which used to be called teachers' colleges, to make them genuine liberal arts colleges, might also change the occupational choice patterns, and this process of curriculum broadening is well under way. In both of these cases, however, the effect of the changes would be to reduce the supply of teachers rather than to increase it, by reducing the proportions of students from low social origins who major in education.

Tables VII-12 and VII-13 suggest that the tendency of working-class students to attend the less prestigeful colleges may have something to do with their tendency to become teachers. The tables compare the backgrounds of the three career planning categories of students in elite and non-elite colleges. The institutions we have defined as "elite" are those generally thought to be the best in North Carolina, of those in our sample. Our impressionistic estimate of their quality could easily be substantiated by reference to various measures such as the proportion of Ph.D.'s on the faculty, test scores of students, and the like, as of the time when our data were collected; some of the non-elite schools have improved since then. While our elite schools are the elite of our sample, they are far from being Ivy League institutions, and they do not include the two institutions in the state which attract the wealthiest and brightest students, Duke University and Davidson College. Specifically, the elite colleges are North Carolina State University, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Salem College, and Meredith College. Nothing would be served by naming the colleges we have insulted by calling them non-elite. The tables refer to white students only; a pecking order exists among the Negro colleges in our sample, but none of them matches the elite white colleges in either faculty credentials or student selectivity.

The percentages in the tables are run in the wrong direction to show this, but a little mental arithmetic with N's and percentages will reveal that students were much more likely to major in education in the

TABLE VII-12. FATHER'S OCCUPATION OF WHITE STUDENT EDUCATION CAREER PLANNERS, EDUCATION NON-CAREER PLANNERS, AND NON-EDUCATION MAJORS, BY SEX AND TYPE OF COLLEGE

Sex, Type of College, and Career Planning Category (N)	White Collar %	Blue Collar %	Agriculture %	White Collar as % of Nonagriculture
Men:				
Elite colleges:				
Education career planners (38)	58	26	16	69
Education non-career planners (39)	51	28	21	65
Non-education majors (582)	70	22	9	76
Non-elite colleges:				
Education career planners (76)	29	58	13	33
Education non-career planners (51)	51	45	4	53
Non-education majors (365)	53	34	13	61
Women:				
Elite colleges:				
Education career planners (32)	69	25	6	73
Education non-career planners (168)	74	17	10	81
Non-education majors (205)	77	17	6	82
Non-elite colleges:				
Education career planners (105)	50	37	13	57
Education non-career planners (239)	53	34	13	61
Non-education majors (187)	53	33	14	62

TABLE VII-13. FATHER'S EDUCATION OF WHITE STUDENT EDUCATION CAREER PLANNERS, EDUCATION NON-CAREER PLANNERS, AND NON-EDUCATION MAJORS BY SEX AND TYPE OF COLLEGE

Sex, Type of College, and Career Planning Category (N)	College Graduate %	High School Graduate %	Not High School Graduate %
Men:			
Elite colleges:			
Education career planners (48)	23	56	21
Education non-career planners (51)	24	49	27
Non-education majors (700)	34	42	25
Non-elite colleges:			
Education career planners (107)	15	36	50
Education non-career planners (69)	7	51	42
Non-education majors (435)	18	43	39
Women:			
Elite colleges:			
Education career planners (39)	31	41	28
Education non-career planners (214)	36	54	10
Non-education majors (261)	45	42	13
Non-elite colleges:			
Education career planners (130)	13	45	42
Education non-career planners (282)	17	46	37
Non-education majors (223)	21	48	32

non-elite than in the elite colleges, and that this was true of students from white-collar, blue-collar, and agricultural backgrounds, with educated and uneducated fathers, considered separately. The latter finding could mean that the type of college attended had an influence on the likelihood of choosing education as a major, but not necessarily; it could mean instead that regardless of their backgrounds, more of the students who went to non-elite colleges were already disposed to major in education.

The percentages in Tables VII-12 and VII-13 show that the student bodies were of higher social origins in the elite colleges than in the non-elite ones. They also show, in general though not completely, that the same patterns of background differences among the three career planning categories of students existed within the elite and non-elite colleges considered separately as among all the students combined. We now turn to these comparisons.

Table VII-12, on father's occupation, indicates that the pattern of lower social origins among education than non-education students, and lower origins among education career planners than non-career planners, generally prevailed in both sexes in both kinds of colleges, though with some exceptions. The pattern was more evident among men than among women. Women in the three career plan categories, in the two kinds of colleges considered separately, did not differ much in background, although such differences as did exist among the women followed the usual pattern. There were two reversals, in these subgroups of students, of the general pattern which existed among students as a whole. First, among men in elite colleges, education career planners were somewhat more likely to be from white-collar origins than were education non-career planners. Second, the four sets of figures show no consistency in the relationships of agricultural backgrounds to choice of major or career planning.

Table VII-13, on father's education, also shows the usual pattern but with a few exceptions. Education majors' fathers were less likely to be college graduates than non-education majors' fathers were, among students of both sexes in both types of colleges; and the education majors' fathers were more likely to be high school dropouts, except in the elite colleges, where education majors collectively and non-education students had about the same percentages of fathers who had not finished high school. The pattern of education career planners' being of lower social origin than education non-career planners was evident among women but not among men; the backgrounds of male education career planners and non-career planners did not differ in any consistent way.

The findings in these two tables do not rule out the hypothesis that the kind of college they attend helps to account for the tendency of people from blue-collar and uneducated backgrounds to become teachers.

Neither, however, do they demonstrate the truth of the hypothesis, for in both kinds of colleges, elite and non-elite, education majors were from lower social origins than non-education majors.

One further observation has a bearing on the characteristics of people who actually teach, as distinct from those who prepare to be teachers. When the N's are inspected, it is apparent that higher proportions of both male and female education majors planned continuous educational careers in the non-elite colleges than in the elite institutions. This means, if students' career expectations are borne out, that the population of graduates actually teaching at any given time overrepresents the products of non-elite teacher training programs.

Concluding remarks on teacher background and recruitment. All of these findings, collectively, indicate that the backgrounds of schoolteachers have stayed about the same, except for the shift from agricultural to blue-collar origins, while the occupational composition of the United States population as a whole has moved continuously upward. Teaching tends to attract people who make it to college but who are restricted, in comparison with other college students, in the variety of occupational opportunities available to them. In comparison with other college graduates, teachers are more likely to be people from rural backgrounds, people from blue-collar backgrounds, Negroes, graduages of non-elite colleges, and women. All of these are groups which face limitations of one sort or another in the range of occupations they can enter. This fact has clear implications for the ability of schools in the future to recruit enough teachers. It may also have implications for student-teacher relations and the morale of teachers.

The agricultural population of the United States is already very small, and is becoming smaller year by year. The effects of this are already evident in the form of teacher shortages in rural areas, since teachers who have grown up in cities tend to prefer to live in cities. We also found effects of the declining rural recruitment base among the education majors we studied; teaching fields which have depended the most heavily on rural recruits--elementary teaching, mathematics, and science--were underrepresented in the students' choices of specialization, relative to the need for teachers in these fields.

Blue-collar workers, Negroes, and students in non-elite colleges are to a certain extent overlapping categories, and increasingly so. These are now growing sources of teacher recruitment, and as long as recruitment from these sources can grow, there should be no absolute shortage of urban teachers though there may be shortages of teachers in certain fields. Blue-collar workers in general, and Negroes in particular, are increasingly able to attend college, and the kinds of non-elite colleges most of them attend are expanding very rapidly in enrollment. The growth of these sources of teacher recruitment is likely to be temporary, however. Right now the ease of entry into middle-level occupations like teaching is increasing more rapidly than the ease of entry into higher-status professional and executive careers, but this may not always be the case; and in the long run we can expect the blue-collar sources of teacher recruitment to diminish, as the number and variety of upper white-collar career opportunities grow while the blue-collar population shrinks as a percentage of the total. Very likely the non-elite colleges which are mushrooming now will upgrade and diversify their curricula as time passes, so that more of their graduages will have a chance to reach the highest rungs of the occupational ladder, and fewer will see their opportunities as confined to middle-prestige work such as teaching.

For the time being, however, the blue-collar stratum should provide a large and growing number of teachers. It is possible to speculate about effects of the growth of this teacher recruitment source. The emerging situation is apt to have, among other implications, racial ones. Up until now, many classrooms in theoretically unsegregated school systems have had white teachers instructing black pupils. Negro leaders have begun to complain about this. Before many years have passed, the more common situation may involve black teachers and white pupils, a condition not likely to call forth universal acclaim from white parents. Something of this kind happened in the 1920's in northeastern and midwestern cities, except that Catholics were then the rising minority group. Teaching was a way out of the slum for the children of immigrants, most of them Catholic Each year saw more Catholic teachers in the public schools than the year before. This was a time when immigration laws were being passed, the Ku Klux Klan was thriving, and many native Protestants had Catholic immigrants very much on their minds. Some interpreted the influx of Catholic teachers as proof of a plot hatched in Rome, and there was much acrimony.[32] There is no present shortage of irritants to American race relations, but here may be another one.

The relatively unchanging backgrounds of teachers, coupled with rising backgrounds of their pupils, may create difficulties in teacher-pupil relations and teacher morale. In the past, teachers were considerably more educated than most parents. Their middle-class orientations made it difficult for them to understand the problems of lower-class students.[33] But middle-class teachers could be objects of emulation and sources of guidance for students from social strata somewhat but not greatly below them, who shared their values, wanted to get ahead, and could turn to the teachers when they found no suitable role models or informed guidance in their homes or neighborhoods. For example, Simpson has shown that these kinds of pupils, moving up from upper blue-collar or lower white-collar families, have benefited the most from vocational counseling at school, the implication being that lower-class children are not reached by the counseling and upper middle-class students do not need it.[34]

---

[32] Counts, op. cit., describes these events as they occurred in Chicago.

[33] Robert J. Havighurst and Hilda Taba, Adolescent Character and Personality, New York: Wiley, 1949; A. B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth, New York, Wiley, 1949; Aaron V. Cicourel and John I. Kitsuse, The Educational Decision-Makers, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963.

Today, however, while teachers' backgrounds, values, and degree of cultural sophistication remain much as they have always been, a large and growing number of their pupils come from families whose status and educational level are higher than the teacher's. The teacher may not be an especially impressive figure to a child from an upper middle-class home, and in addition, many such children are rejecting the traditional middle-class values and life styles which teachers have to a high degree. By the time the privileged suburban child reaches high school, the teachers' blue-collar origin, non-elite college background, and resolutely traditional value orientations may contribute to a situation in which the teacher is an object of scorn, not a model to be emulated. The parents of such children often make matters worse, undermining the teacher's authority by failing to conceal their own lack of respect for teachers and complaining to the principal whenever the teacher does something which displeases the child. Becker found that most teachers do not like slum schools, but neither are upper middle-class schools their favorites; rather, they like schools whose pupils are from families slightly below the teachers themselves in social status.[35] Such pupils tend to be well behaved, they take instructions and respect the teacher, and their parents do not consider themselves better educational experts than the teacher. Lower middle- and upper working-class parents may even support the teacher rather than the child in disputes, and tell the child to do what the teacher says, because their values are likely to include a belief in authority and discipline.

More has been written about the problems of teachers' relations with lower-class children, but their relations with affluent suburbanite children who look down on them and their conventional values may become just as big a problem in the future, at least from the teachers' standpoint. Many teachers will have fulfilled their dreams of upward mobility, but the mobility will have landed them in the middle mass, nowhere near the top of the ladder, and they may feel severe status threats from parents and pupils who consider them old-fashioned lowbrows. The only audience to whom they play with a good expectation of success is the audience of pupils from the same kinds of backgrounds they themselves have come from, and there will be fewer and fewer such pupils in the future. Our findings on the prevalence of holistic service orientations among teachers, and the Rosenberg and Davis studies of college students' value orientations, suggest that teachers need social approval even more than most people do. They may have an increasingly hard time getting it from their pupils, and they do not have the intellectually based colleague reference group solidarity which might enable them to get more of it from each other.

---

[34] Richard L. Simpson, "Occupational Careers and Mobility," in F. Stuart Chapin, Jr. and Shirley F. Weiss (eds.), Urban Growth Dynamics, New York: Wiley, 1962, pp. 400-420. See pp. 405-408.

[35] Howard S. Becker, "The Career of the Chicago Public Schoolteacher," American Journal of Sociology, 57 (1952), pp. 470-477.

Groups in this kind of situation, economically secure but with feelings of status insecurity and an uneasy sense that the world is moving past them and their values, have often been a fertile source of support for extremist political movements of the right.[36] Whether or not any speculation of this kind about the potential political behavior of teachers is warranted, it seems a fairly straightforward inference from our data on teacher recruitment, plus the known trends in the American class system and the values of the higher strata, to predict problems of teacher morale. Their relative social status will have declined, they will feel uncomfortable with both poor and affluent students, and their traditional values of sober propriety and hard work will be under attack from above, below, and the mass media.

The preceding discussion has visualized a period during which the blue-collar recruitment source of teachers will be growing--perhaps the rest of the twentieth century or most of it. But after a while, this source of teachers will start to dry up, just as the rural source already has. In all probability, this will still leave the women. Like the other students in our sample, women were more likely to major in education if Negro than if white, if rural than if urban, and if from low than if from high social origins; but the race, community, and class differences between education and non-education majors were less pronounced among women than among men. Apparently high-status urban women remain more willing to teach than men of similar backgrounds are, whether because they feel barred from other occupations which discriminate against women or, more likely, because they see teaching as a pleasant feminine job in which they can be of service to others. Whatever the reason is, the upgrading of the American occupational structure probably will not hurt the recruitment of women teachers as much as it will hurt the recruitment of men teachers, though it may hurt it noticeably.

---

[36] See Daniel Bell (ed.), The New American Right, New York: Criterion, 1955, especially the essays by Richard Hofstadter and S. M. Lipset; also Daniel Bell, The End of Ideology, rev. ed., New York: Free Press, 1962, pp. 103-123 ("Status Politics and New Anxieties"). The clergy are in a somewhat comparable situation, once intellectual leaders and now no longer so as the belief in traditional religion has declined and experts of various sorts have taken over their non-theological functions such as counseling and secular opinion leadership. Many fundamentalist ministers have been active in right-wing movements, and theologically liberal ministers have cast about for a meaningful social role and have found it in secular liberal, sometimes radical, activism. Such activity often makes them feel alienated from their conservative congregations, and may put them in the same psychological position as that of unattached intellectuals, despite their structural attachment to so traditional an institution as the church.

We have seen that women teachers tend not to be very professional in outlook or behavior. Their orientations are typically humanitarian, not technical or intellectual. A nurturant, holistic attitude may not work well with the alienated poor or the cynical rich, and the traditionally minded mass will supply a declining proportion of the pupils. This means that whether or not an affectively neutral, technical professional orientation has been desirable in the teachers of the past, it may be necessary in the future if teachers are to bridge the growing gap between their own traditional values and the alienated, liberated, antitraditional values of students at both ends of the class system. Unfortunately we are not able to propose a recipe for developing and instilling the kind of professionalism that seems required.

Postscript

Coleman, Campbell and associates carried out a massive nationwide survey of pupil learning and school characteristics, to find out why so many people go to school without learning much.[37] Their main purpose was to discover why average Negro school performance is so poor, in the hope that action might be taken to improve it once the causes were known, but their study has application to education generally, and their sample included all kinds of students and schools. Their findings were something of a letdown, for they found that most of the variation in school performance was attributable to factors wholly or largely beyond the control of the schools. Home backgrounds and the social class compositions of schools made large difference in pupil performance, but such things as school budgets, teacher preparation or lack of it, the presence or absence of libraries, and the like made little difference. Students learned about as much from ill trained teachers as from well trained ones; they learned as much in rickety buildings as in ultramodern school plants, if other conditions were equal; and so on. Someone reading the Coleman-Campbell Report might logically conclude that spending money on schools is foolish, and that anyone at all will do as a teacher.

---

[37] James S. Coleman, Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederic D. Weinfield, and Robert L. York, Equality of Educational Opportunity, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

The report was lavishly financed and extremely well executed, and its finding that the teacher characteristics the authors studied had little effect on pupil performance cannot be disputed; it is a fact. But it is a fact in the aggregate, and undoubtedly the aggregative data concealed variations in effectiveness of teachers due to variables the authors did not study. The variables they chose to examine were good ones, given the state of knowledge about learning, but they could not study everything. Probably everyone is convinced that he learned more from some of his own teachers than from others, whether or not he could say why in terms of variables a social scientist might study or a school system might do anything about.

Just as Coleman et al. could not discover characteristics of the best teachers, our much more modest study did not reach any definitive conclusions about the characteristics of the most professional teachers, nor did we find out how the occupation of teaching might be made more professional. But this does not mean that some teachers are not better than others, or that professional teachers are not better on the average than unprofessional ones. It seems desirable not to conclude that teachers are all alike or that their differences do not matter, but to continue with research to see which teaching methods are the best, which kinds of teachers use them, and whether professionalism may not be an ingredient in the effectiveness of teachers, at least under some conditions. If professionalism does prove to be related to teacher effectiveness, efforts should be made to discover ways to make the occupation, or some segments of it, more professional. Concerning these questions our research has been partly inconclusive and partly gloomy about the prospects of professionalizing the occupation; but this should be regarded as a challenge to more and better efforts, not as a reason to give up the idea.

APPENDIX A

THE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDY OF TEACHER ROLES

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

This is a study of the roles of public school teachers at work, in their homes, and in their communities, and of the ways in which they feel about the teaching profession. The study is financed by the United States Office of Education, and is being conducted by the Institute for Research in Social Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The Office of Education hopes that the results will be useful in recruiting and keeping qualified teachers.

We are asking thousands of teachers throughout North Carolina to fill out this questionnaire and return it to us for statistical analysis. Your replies will be **completely confidential.** You can aid in the understanding of the teaching profession and its problems by returning your questionnaire to us. Here are a few necessary instructions:

1. Your name will not appear on the questionnaire, but we will appreciate your signing the attached post card and returning it separately to us. This will tell us that you have returned your questionnaire, but without our knowing which questionnaire is yours.

2. Please answer all the questions that apply to you. Most of them can be answered by using check-marks (√) but if you want to add explanations or comments, you are encouraged to do so on the margin.

3. Please answer frankly, according to your own opinions. Do not consult with others.

4. Pay no attention to the numbers beside the questions and answers. They are for statistical tabulation of replies on an electronic computer.

6. When did you first consider going into teaching?

1............6th grade or earlier.
2............7th, 8th, or 9th grade.
3............After 9th grade, but before senior year of high school.
4............Senior year of high school.
5............Freshman year of college.
6............Sophomore year of college.
7............Junior year of college.
8............Senior year of college.
9............After college.

7. When did you definitely decide to go into teaching?

1............6th grade or earlier.
2............7th, 8th, or 9th grade.
3............After 9th grade, but before senior year of high school.
4............Senior year of high school.
5............Freshman year of college.
6............Sophomore year of college.
7............Junior year of college.
8............Senior year of college.
9............After college.

8. Did you think seriously about going into some occupation other than teaching? If so, what occupation?

............Yes, I thought about going into..................................
9............No, I never considered anything but teaching.

9. Please **place in rank order,** in order of **how much they influenced your deciding to become a teacher,** any of the following who influenced your decision. Indicate with a "1" for the most influential person, a "2" for the second most influential, etc. Leave blank any who did not influence your decision to become a teacher.

1............A friend, about your own age.
2............Mother.
3............Father.
4............A brother, sister, or other relative.
5............A teacher in the first 8 grades.
6............A teacher in grades 9-12.
7............A professor in college.
8............Someone else.
Y............None of these influenced me.

10. Which **one** of the following reasons had the most influence on your deciding to become a teacher?

1............Chance to combine a career and good family life.
2............Better income than in other occupations.
3............More chance for advancement than in other occupations.
4............More interesting work than in other occupations.
5............Teaching was the only acceptable work I was qualified for. Otherwise I might have preferred something else.
6............Teaching was the only acceptable work I could get in the community where I wanted to live.

11. How many family members or relatives did you know while you were growing up, who were teachers?

0............None.
1............1
2............2
3............3
4............4 or more.

12. How much influence do you think these teachers in your family had on your deciding to become a teacher?

Y............No teachers in family.
0............No influence.
1............Some influence.
2............Much influence.

13. Which one of the following statements best describes how you felt when you took your first teaching position?

1............I wanted a lifelong career in teaching.
2............I wanted a career in education, but hoped some day to move into school administration and leave classroom teaching.
3............I wanted to teach for a while, but hoped eventually to stop working and be a full-time housewife.
4............I wanted to teach for a while, but hoped eventually to get into a different kind of work.
5............I would have preferred to be entering some different kind of work from the start.

14. Think of your three best friends of your own sex at college during your last year as an undergraduate. How many of these took teaching positions after they finished their education?

0............None of them.
1............One of them.
2............Two of them.
3............All three of them.
Y............I don't know how many of them did.

15. Think of the professors at your undergraduate college, or at the last one you attended if you attended more than one. How many of them knew you fairly well as a person? Circle the number.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

16. Of these professors who knew you fairly well as a person, how many were professors of education? Circle the number.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

Below are listed six pairs of activities. For each pair, please check whichever activity would usually appeal to you more.

17. 1............Attending a professional meeting or convention.
2............Taking a trip with your family.

18. 1............Reading about ways to improve teaching methods.
2............Reading about ways to improve family life.

19. 1............Talking about your work.
2............Talking about events in your community.

20. 1............Working on a committee at school.
2............Working in a community organization, such as a civic club or garden club.

21. 1............Working in a community organization, such as a civic club or garden club.
2............Working to beautify your home.

22. 1............Talking about events and personalities in your community.
2............Talking about your family.

---

23. Which are you really more interested in, your career or your community?

1............Career.
2............Community.

Assuming that the man and the woman have equal ability, which one do you think MOST TEACHERS would have more respect for, in the following situations?

24. 1............A **man** who teaches the 5th grade.
2............A **woman** who teaches the 5th grade.
3............Same respect for both.

25. 1............A **man** who teaches high school algebra.
2............A **woman** who teaches high school algebra.
3............Same respect for both.

26. 1............A **man** who is ambitious to become principal of an elementary school.
2............A **woman** who is ambitious to become principal of an elementary school.
3............Same respect for both.

Which one do you think the GENERAL PUBLIC would have more respect for?

27. 1............A **man** who teaches the 5th grade.
2............A **woman** who teaches the 5th grade.
3............Same respect for both.

28. 1............A **man** who teaches high school algebra.
2............A **woman** who teaches high school algebra.
3............Same respect for both.

29. 1............A **man** who is ambitious to become principal of an elementary school.
2............A **woman** who is ambitious to become principal of an elementary school.
3............Same respect for both.

The next few questions ask for your opinion as to how much prestige the teachers of different high school or junior high school subjects have, with the general public and with the teachers themselves. Assuming that the teachers are all equally competent, how high would the general standing of each teacher be, just on the basis of the subject he or she teaches? Indicate with a "1" if the prestige is higher than average, a "2" if the prestige is average, and a "3" if the prestige is lower than average.

First, suppose that the teacher is a **man.** How much prestige would he have with the **general public,** in comparison with most men teachers, if he teaches each of the subjects below?

30. English: 1........high 2........average 3........low
31. Mathematics: 1........high 2........average 3........low
32. A foreign language: 1........high 2........average 3........low
33. Social studies: 1........high 2........average 3........low
34. Science: 1........high 2........average 3........low
35. Physical education: 1........high 2........average 3........low

Now, suppose that the teacher is a **woman.** How much prestige would she have with the **general public,** in comparison with most women teachers, if she teaches each of the subjects below?

36. English: 1........high 2........average 3........low
37. Mathematics: 1........high 2........average 3........low
38. A foreign language: 1........high 2........average 3........low
39. Social studies: 1........high 2........average 3........low
40. Science: 1........high 2........average 3........low
41. Physical education: 1........high 2........average 3........low

Suppose again that the teacher is a **man.** How high do you suppose his prestige or standing would be with **other teachers,** if he teaches each of the subjects below?

42. English: 1........high 2........average 3........low
43. Mathematics 1........high 2........average 3........low
44. A foreign language: 1........high 2........average 3........low
45. Social studies: 1........high 2........average 3........low
46. Science: 1........high 2........average 3........low
47. Physical education: 1........high 2........average 3........low

Suppose again that the teacher is a **woman.** How high do you suppose her prestige or standing would be with **other teachers,** if she teaches each of the subjects below?

48. English: 1........high 2........average 3........low
49. Mathematics: 1........high 2........average 3........low
50. A foreign language: 1........high 2........average 3........low
51. Social studies: 1........high 2........average 3........low
52. Science: 1........high 2........average 3........low
53. Physical education: 1........high 2........average 3........low

---

Do you think that some high school subjects are more appropriate for men or for women to teach? For each subject listed below, check whether you think it is a more appropriate subject for a woman to teach, or for a man to teach, or equally appropriate for both.

	More Appropriate for a Man	**Makes No Difference**	**More Appropriate for a Woman**
54. English:	1............	2............	3............
55. Mathematics:	1............	2............	3............
56. A foreign language:	1............	2............	3............
57. Social studies:	1............	2............	3............
58. Science:	1............	2............	3............

The purpose of this next section is to get your impressions of what teachers are like by having you judge different kinds of teachers and other people on a series of scales. For each kind of person, there are several pairs of words or phrases meaning opposite things. For each pair of words, circle the number that indicates at what position between the two opposites the person would be. "4" is the half-way point.
Here is an example. Suppose that you think that a typical banker is rich, and that a carpenter is slightly below average in income but not extremely poor. Then you might mark these two people as follows:

BANKER

000. **Rich [✓ 1] 2 3 4 5 6 7 Poor**

CARPENTER

000. **Rich 1 2 3 4 [✓ 5] 6 7 Poor**

Now for the actual people you are asked to describe:

AVERAGE HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER (WOMAN)

59. Warm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Cold
60. Frustrated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Contented
61. Boring 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Interesting
62. More interested in subject matter 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in children
63. Lenient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strict
64. More interested in career 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in home and family

AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER (WOMAN)

65. Warm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Cold
66. Frustrated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Contented
67. Boring 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Interesting
68. More interested in subject matter 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in children
69. Lenient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strict
70. More interested in career 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in home and family

IDEAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER (WOMAN)

71. Lenient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strict
72. More interested in subject matter 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in children
73. More interested in career 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in home and family

IDEAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER (WOMAN)

74. Lenient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strict
75. More interested in subject matter 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in children
76. More interested in career 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in home and family

AVERAGE HOUSEWIFE WHO DOES NOT HAVE A JOB

77. Warm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Cold

78. Frustrated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Contented

79. Boring 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Interesting

YOURSELF

80. Warm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Cold

B6. Frustrated 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Contented

B7. Boring 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Interesting

B8. More interested in subject matter 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in children

B9. More interested in career 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 More interested in home and family

B10. Lenient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strict

B11. Now we would like to know something of your educational preparation for teaching. Please give the information requested below about **all** of the colleges or universities you have attended for as long as a semester, a quarter, or a summer session. Start with the **first** college you attended and work up to the most recent.

1. Name of college ____________

Dates when you attended ____________

Major subject (if any). (If it was education, indicate what specialty—for example, elementary education, educational administration, etc.—and if you had a subject matter specialty besides education, such as mathematics, history, etc., please give this also.) ____________

Degree earned (if any) ____________

— — — — — — —

2. College ____________

Dates attended ____________

Major subject ____________

Degree ____________

— — — — — — —

3. College ____________

Dates attended ____________

Major subject ____________

Degree ____________

4. College ____________

Dates attended ____________

Major subject ____________

Degree ____________

— — — — — — —

5. College ____________

Dates attended ____________

Major subject ____________

Degree ____________

— — — — — — —

6. College ____________

Dates attended ____________

Major subject ____________

Degree ____________

— — — — — — —

7. College ____________

Dates attended ____________

Major subject ____________

Degree ____________

— — — — — — —

8. College ____________

Dates attended ____________

Major subject ____________

Degree ____________

— — — — — — —

If you have attended more than eight colleges, check here ☐ and continue listing them in the blank space at the end of the questionnaire. Above all, please be sure that you have listed your most recent college and your highest degree.

B12. What kind of teaching certificate do you have?

1..........Graduate.
2..........Class A.
3..........Class B.
4..........Class C.
5..........Emergency A.
6..........Emergency B.
7..........Non-standard.
8..........Other; if so, what kind?..........

B13. Now we would like to know about the teaching positions you have held. **First,** please give the information requested about your **present teaching position.** Second, describe your **student or practice teaching,** if you did any. Then, starting with the **first position** you ever held (unless your first and present positions are the same), describe all your regular teaching positions before the present one. Count each change of school separately, but not changes of assignment within the same school. (Since the questionnaire does not identify individuals, we need this information to classify types of teachers and careers.)

Z. **Present position.** Grade and/or subject taught..........................

....

Circle approximate size of community:

Rural   2,499 or less   2,500-9,999   10,000-49,999   50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.   In South but not N. C.   Outside South

Date you began teaching there (month and year)..........................

....

---

0. **Student teaching.** Grade and/or subject..........................

Circle community size:

Rural   2,499 or less   2,500-9,999   10,000-49,999   50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.   In South but not N. C.   Outside South

Dates ....to..................................

---

1. **First regular job.** Grade and/or subject..........................

Circle community size:

Rural   2,499 or less   2,500-9,999   10,000-49,999   50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.   In South but not N. C.   Outside South

Dates ....to..................................

---

2. **Second regular job.** Grade and/or subject..........................

Circle community size:

Rural   2,499 or less   2,500-9,999   10,000-49,999   50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.   In South but not N. C.   Outside South

Dates ....to..................................

3. **Third regular job.** Grade and/or subject..........................

Circle community size:

Rural   2,499 or less   2,500-9,999   10,000-49,999   50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.   In South but not N. C.   Outside South

Dates ....to..................................

---

4. **Fourth regular job.** Grade and/or subject..........................

Circle community size:

Rural   2,499 or less   2,500-9,999   10,000-49,999   50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.   In South but not N. C.   Outside South

Dates ....to..................................

---

5. **Fifth regular job.** Grade and/or subject..........................

Circle community size:

Rural   2,499 or less   2,500-9,999   10,000-49,999   50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.   In South but not N. C.   Outside South

Dates ....to..................................

---

6. **Sixth regular job.** Grade and/or subject..........................

Circle community size:

Rural   2,499 or less   2,500-9,999   10,000-49,999   50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.   In South but not N. C.   Outside South

Dates ....to..................................

---

7. **Seventh regular job.** Grade and/or subject..........................

Circle community size:

Rural   2,499 or less   2,500-9,999   10,000-49,999   50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.   In South but not N. C.   Outside South

Dates ....to..................................

8. **Eighth regular job.** Grade and/or subject..............................

Circle community size:

Rural	2,499 or less	2,500-9,999	10,000-49,999	50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.	In South but not N. C.	Outside South

Dates ....to..

9. **Ninth regular job.** Grade and/or subject..............................

Circle community size:

Rural	2,499 or less	2,500-9,999	10,000-49,999	50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.	In South but not N. C.	Outside South

Dates ....to..

10. **Tenth regular job.** Grade and/or subject..............................

Circle community size:

Rural	2,499 or less	2,500-9,999	10,000-49,999	50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.	In South but not N. C.	Outside South

Dates ....to..

11. **Eleventh regular job.** Grade and/or subject..............................

Circle community size:

Rural	2,499 or less	2,500-9,999	10,000-49,999	50,000 or more

Circle location:

N. C.	In South but not N. C.	Outside South

Dates ....to..

If you have have more than twelve teaching positions, check here ☐ and continue listing them in the blank space at the end of the questionnaire or on separate sheets.

B14. Have you ever worked as a substitute teacher? If so, during how many school years?

0............No, I have never worked as a substitute.
............Yes, I have worked as a substitute during............ school years.

B15. After you finished high school but before you received your first teaching certificate, were you continuously a student (other than between college academic years) or did you leave school for a while to work?

0............I was continuously a student and never stopped school except at vacation times.
............I left school to work for a period of............years.

B16. While you were a college student, did you work at a job during one or more summers between college years?

1............Had summer job.
2............Did not have summer job.

B17. While you were a college student, did you work at one or more jobs part-time or in the short vacation times during the school year between September and May?

1............Had part-time job.
2............Did not have part-time job.

B18. **Since you took your first teaching position,** have you held any jobs that were not in teaching?

0............No. IF 'NO,' SKIP TO QUESTION B20.
1............Yes.

B19. IF 'YES' TO QUESTION B18: What were these jobs? Please identify them, starting with the first one and working up to the most recent if you have had more than one.

Type of Work	Length of Time Held	Check if Summer Job Only	Check if Part-Time
1....................................	....	....	....
2....................................	....	....	....
3....................................	....	....	....
4....................................	....	....	....
5....................................	....	....	....
6....................................	....	....	....

If you have held more than six non-teaching jobs since you received your first teaching certificate, check here ☐ and list the rest at the back of the questionnaire or on separate sheets.

B20. If you held another teaching position before your present one, what was the **single most important reason** for changing to your present position?

0............Have never changed teaching positions.
1............Reason not connected with the position itself (for example: school closer to home; to move to a community I preferred to live in; husband's job took us to a different community).
2............Professional advancement (higher salary, more desirable school system, etc.).
3———To get a position I liked better, though it did not necessarily involve professional advancement.
4———Other; what? ....

How do you feel about the following policies or programs?

B21. Pupils are separated into bright and slow classes.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesirable.
4............Strongly undesirable.

B22. In the first six grades, pupils must meet specified academic standards in order to be promoted.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesirable.
4............Strongly undesirable.

B23. Sex education in high school.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesirable.
4............Strong undesirable.

B24. A lot of emphasis on extracurricular activities.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesriable.
4............Strongly undesirable.

B25. Numerical grading given on regular report cards in the first six grades.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesirable.
4............Strongly undesirable.

B26. Different salaries for elementary and high school teachers.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesirable.
4............Strongly undesirable.

B27. More emphasis placed on developing individual interests of the pupil than on teaching identical subject matter to all pupils.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesirable.
4............Strongly undesirable.

B28. Teacher participation in policy-making.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesirable.
4............Strongly undesirable.

B29. Pupils form regularly into lines on the way to and from classes.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesirable.
4............Strongly undesirable.

B30. Extensive use of psychological and mental tests.

1............Strongly desirable.
2............Desirable.
3............Undesirable.
4............Strongly undesirable.

In this section, you are asked to agree or disagree with a series of statements. Situations are described, and the statements concern these situations. For each statement, please circle a number to indicate whether you STRONGLY AGREE (1), SOMEWHAT AGREE (2), ARE UNDECIDED (3), SOMEWHAT DISAGREE (4), or STRONGLY DISAGREE (5).

A. Although it is against school rules, two teachers often "trade work" with each other. For example, one of them will take over the other's class so that the other can leave work early. Another teacher reports this to the principal.

B31. Teachers **should** report all infractions of rules. 1 2 3 4 5

B32. At my school teachers **do** report all infractions of rules. 1 2 3 4 5

B. In talking with acquaintances who are not teachers, some teachers discuss their opinions about policies of their school that they disagree with.

B33. Teachers **should** discuss their opinions about their school whenever they want to. 1 2 3 4 5

B34. Most teachers at my school **do** discuss their opinions about school policies with outsiders. 1 2 3 4 5

C. Some teachers seem willing to do more than others to gain respect from the principal. The opinions of such teachers about teaching methods are strongly influenced by the opinions of their superiors.

B35. The opinions of superiors **should be** an important influence on the opinions of teachers. 1 2 3 4 5

B36. The opinions of the principal **are** an important influence on the opinions of most teachers at my school. 1 2 3 4 5

D. A principal insists that teachers follow in detail the rules about proper record-keeping. Most teachers think that some of these rules are impractical, but the rules are strictly enforced.

B37. A principal **should** enforce all the rules. 1 2 3 4 5

B38. At my school the principal **does** enforce all the rules. 1 2 3 4 5

E. Some teachers try to put their ideas about good teaching into practice even if it sometimes means breaking school regulations.

B39. Teachers **should** put their ideas into practice. even if it means breaking a few rules. 1 2 3 4 5

B40. At my school teachers **do** put their ideas into practice even if it means breaking a few rules. 1 2 3 4 5

F. Almost all the teachers in one school are active members of professional education organizations. They attend all the conferences and meetings they can.

B41. All teachers **should be** active in professional organizations. 1 2 3 4 5

B42. Most teachers at my school **are** active in professional organizations. 1 2 3 4 5

G. In one school all the teachers spend, on the average, at least four hours a week reading professional material and attending lectures.

B43. All teachers **should** spend at least four hours a week improving themselves professionally. 1 2 3 4 5

B44. Most teachers at my school **do** spend at least four hours a week improving themselves professionally. 1 2 3 4 5

H. Some teachers believe that they can be excellent teachers without getting any more formal education than the minimum requirements for certification.

B45. Being an excellent teacher **does not** require formal education beyond the amount required for certification. 1 2 3 4 5

B46. At my school most teachers **do not believe** that a lot of formal education is needed to be a good teacher. 1 2 3 4 5

I. Some teachers spend a lot of time discussing students' problems with their parents.

B47. Teachers **should** spend a lot of time discussing students' problems with their parents. 1 2 3 4 5

B48. In my school, most teachers **do** spend a lot of time discussing students' problems with their parents. 1 2 3 4 5

J. Some teachers feel that they should not only be concerned with students' scholastic performance, but should counsel with students about their emotional problems.

B49. Teachers **should** concern themselves with students' emotional problems. 1 2 3 4 5

B50. In my school, most teachers **do** concern themselves with students' emotional problems. 1 2 3 4 5

K. In some schools the ability of a teacher to understand the psychological reasons behind a student's behavior is considered a more important skill than her ability to maintain classroom discipline.

B51. Understanding what lies behind students' behavior **should be** considered more important than maintaining classroom discipline. 1 2 3 4 5

B52. In my school, understanding what lies behind students' behavior **is** considered more important than maintaining classroom discipline. 1 2 3 4 5

L. Some people feel that teachers who regard teaching as a way to give humanitarian service to other people are the ones who should be praised and rewarded most highly.

B53. Teachers who regard their work as a way to give humanitarian service **should be** praised and rewarded the most highly. 1 2 3 4 5

B54. In my school, teachers who regard their work as a way to give humanitarian service **are** praised and rewarded the most highly. 1 2 3 4 5

M. THIS NEXT QUESTION IS FOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS ONLY. OTHERS SKIP TO QUESTION B57. Some teachers believe that interscholastic athletics are a vital part of a high school program and should be given every encouragement Others feel that athletics are overemphasized at the expense of things that are more important.

B55. Interscholastic athletics **ought to be** strongly encouraged. 1 2 3 4 5

B56. In my school, interscholastic athletics **are** strongly encouraged. 1 2 3 4 5

Listed below are some things many teachers do. Please check the one response to each item which comes closest to your own feeling about it.

B57. Attending PTA meetings:

1............I attend, because I feel that attending them is necessary in order to be a good teacher.
2............I attend because I enjoy them, although I do not feel they are necessary in order to be a good teacher.
3............I attend because I am expected or required to go.
4............I do not attend.

B58. Acting as sponsor of a club, the yearbook, or some other student extracurricular activity:

1............I sponsor activities, because this is part of being a good teacher.
2............I sponsor activities, because I enjoy it, even though it is not an essential part of being a good teacher.
3............I sponsor activities because I am expected or required to do so.
4............I do not sponsor any extracurricular activities.

B59. Having playground, cafeteria, or bus duty:

1............I enjoy it.
2............I feel neutral about it.
3............I dislike it.

B60. Keeping records:

1............I don't mind keeping records at all, since it is part of being a good teacher.
2............I don't like keeping records, but realize that it is a necessary part of teaching.
3............Much record-keeping is senseless drudgery, and I would not do it if it were not required of me.

B61. Working with other teachers on committees:

1............I enjoy it.
2............I don't mind it.
3............I dislike it.
4............I don't work with other teachers on committees.

B62. Making out report cards:

1............Report cards are an important part of education, so I don't mind making them out.
2............Report cards are important, but I dislike making them out.
3............Report cards are not very important, but I don't mind making them out.
4............Report cards are not very important, and I dislike making them out.

B63. Meeting with parents:

1............It often helps both the parents and myself.
2............It sometimes helps both the parents and myself.
3............It seldom helps either the parents or myself.

B64. Meeting with the principal and/or other administrators about complaints by parents:

1............I find it of great help to me.
2............I find it of some help to me.
3............I find it of little help to me.

B65. Meeting with the principal about disciplinary problems:

1............It is usually helpful to me.
2............It is sometimes helpful to me.
3............It is rarely helpful to me.
4............It is never helpful to me.

B66. Staying late to discipline a child:

1............I don't really mind it.
2............I dislike it, but do it anyway at times.
3............I dislike it and almost never do it.

B67. Teaching a subject that is not a specialty of yours:

1............I would not mind it at all.
2............I would mind it a little, but would not refuse.
3............I would mind it a lot, but would not refuse.
4............I would refuse.

B68. Making out written lesson plans:

1............A necessity to be a good teacher.
2............Not a necessity, but expected of you.
3............Just some extra drudgery.

B69. Failing a child:

1............It does not bother me to give a child an F, if he deserves it.
2............It bothers me somewhat to give a child an F, even if he deserves it.
3............It bothers me very much to give a child an F.
4............It bothers me so much that I sometimes give a passing grade, even though the child deserves an F.

Please place in RANK ORDER, in order of HOW IMPORTANT THEY ARE TO YOU, any of the following which are THINGS THAT YOU LIKE ABOUT TEACHING. Indicate with a "1" the thing that is most important to you, a "2" the second most important thing, etc. Leave blank any which you do NOT like about teaching or which are not important to you.

RANK GOOD ASPECTS OF TEACHING

B70............Being drawn into a lot of community activities.
B71............Spending a lot of time with other teachers.
B72............Figuring out ways to deal with problems that arise in class.
B73............Spending a lot of time working with children.
B74............Being thought of in the community as a teacher.

Now place in rank order, in order of how important they are to you, any of these same things which you do NOT like about teaching. Leave blank any which you LIKE or which are not important to you.

RANK BAD ASPECTS OF TEACHING

B75............Being drawn into a lot of community activities.
B76............Spending a lot of time with other teachers.
B77............Figuring out ways to deal with problems that arise in class.
B78............Spending a lot of time working with children.
B79............Being thought of in the community as a teacher.

B80. How satisfied are you with your present teaching position, compared with what you imagine most teaching positions are like?

1............It is the best teaching position I can realistically imagine.
2............It is better than most teaching positions.
3............It is about as good as most teaching positions.
4............It is inferior to most teaching positions.

C6. How would you rate the general ability of the teachers in your school?

1............Outstanding.
2............Above average.
3............Average.
4............Below average.

7. How would you rate the satisfaction of most teachers with your school?

1...........Outstanding.
2...........Above average.
3...........Average.
4...........Below average.

8. How would you rate the willingness of older teachers in your school to help the new teachers?

1...........Outstanding.
2...........Above average.
3...........Average.
4...........Below average.

9. How would you rate the attitude of the students in your school?

1...........Outstanding.
2...........Above average.
3...........Average.
4...........Below average.

10. How would you rate the attitude of the parents?

1...........Outstanding.
2...........Above average.
3...........Average.
4...........Below average.

11. How would you rate the respect of people in your community for teachers?

1...........Outstanding.
2...........Above average.
3...........Average.
4...........Below average.

---

hether or not you expect to stay in teaching permanently,
lease RANK the following things, in order of their impor-
nce as reasons why you have stayed in teaching so far.
eave blank any which are not reasons for your staying in
eaching.

RANK REASONS FOR STAYING IN TEACHING

C12...........I like the work.
C13...........I like the professional status a teacher has.
C14...........I need the money, and don't know where I could find other acceptable work that would pay better.

---

15. Which one of the following statements best describes the way you feel now about your future as a teacher?

0...........I will reach retirement age soon, so the question does not really apply to me.
1...........I want a life-long career in teaching.
2...........I want a career in education, but hope some day to move into school administration and leave classroom teaching.
3...........I want to teach for a while longer, but hope some day to stop working and be a full-time housewife.
4...........I want to teach for a while longer, but hope some day to change to a different kind of work.
5...........I would really prefer to be in some different kind of work right now.

C16. Speaking for yourself, how satisfying has teaching been as a career?

1...........The most satisfying career I can realistically imagine.
2...........More satisfying than most careers.
3...........About as satisfying as most careers.
4...........Less satisfying than most careers.

C17. Would you advise a son of yours to become a teacher? (Answer even if you don't have a son.)

1...........Definitely yes.
2...........Probably yes.
3...........Probably no.
4...........Definitely no.

C18. Would you advise a daughter of yours to become a teacher? (Answer even if you don't have a daughter.)

1...........Definitely yes.
2...........Probably yes.
3...........Probably no.
4...........Definitely no.

C19. How satisfied are you with the present quality of your own teaching?

1...........Completely satisfied.
2...........Very satisfied.
3...........Fairly satisfied.
4...........Not satisfied.

C20. Do you think most of your teaching colleagues would rate your success in teaching as:

1...........Very superior.
2...........Superior.
3...........Don't know.
4...........About average.
5...........Below average.

C21. On the average, about how much time do you spend each month in reading books and journals about schools and education? (Do not include reading in subject matter specialties.)

0...........Less than an hour a month.
1...........1 to 3 hours a month.
2...........4 to 6 hours a month.
3...........7 to 9 hours a month.
4...........10 to 15 hours a month.
5...........16 or more hours a month.

C22. On the average, about how much time do you spend each month in reading in the subject matter field or fields that you teach?

0...........Less than an hour a month.
1...........1 to 3 hours a month.
2...........4 to 6 hours a month.
3...........7 to 9 hours a month.
4...........10 to 15 hours a month.
5...........16 or more hours a month.

C23. About how many days do you spend in an average year attending educational conferences, conventions, etc.? Write in the number.

....

C24. For how many years, including this year, have you been teaching with your present principal?

1............This is my first year.
2............2 to 4 years.
3............5 to 7 years.
4............8 to 10 years.
5............11 years or longer.

C25. What would you say is the social class of most of the children you teach?

1............Upper class.
2............Upper-middle class.
3............Middle class.
4............Lower-middle class.
5............Working class.
6............Lower class.

C26. How many teachers are there in your school?

1............13 or fewer.
2............14 to 25.
3............26 to 40.
4............41 or more.

C27. How many pupils are enrolled in your school?

1............100 or fewer.
2............101-500.
3............501-1,000.
4............1,001-1,500.
5............1,501 or more.

C28. About how many students do you usually have in a class?

1............15 or fewer.
2............16-25.
3............26-30.
4............31-35.
5............36 or more.

Does any person or group in your school have an especially strong voice in influencing the way the principal deals with teachers, students, curriculum, or other important school matters? CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

C29............No one influences the principal.
C30............A teacher or group of teachers who have been in the school a long time.
C31............A teacher or group of teachers.
C32............His wife, if she works in the school.
C33............The school secretary.
C34............The vice principal or assistant principal.
C35............The dean of girls or dean of boys.
C36............All of the teachers.
C37............Other; who? ....

Not counting the superintendent or the school board, do any people outside the school have an especially strong voice in influencing the way the principal deals with teachers, students, curriculum, or other important school matters? CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

C38............No one outside the school influences the principal.
C39............His wife.
C40............Socially prominent people who have children in the school.
C41............Community or state politicians or government officials.
C42............Other; who? ....

C43. What **one person** in the administration of your school do most teachers most often come into contact with?

1............Principal.
2............Vice principal or assistant principal.
3............Dean of girls or dean of boys.
4............Guidance counselor.
5............Other; who? ....

C44. What one person in the administration of your school do you think most teachers see most often for advice on how to conduct their classes?

1............Principal.
2............Vice principal or assistant principal.
3............Dean of girls or dean of boys.
4............School secretary.
5............Guidance counselor.
6............Other; who? ....

C45. What one person in the administration of your school are the teachers **supposed** to see about how to conduct their classes?

1............Principal.
2............Vice principal or assistant principal.
3............Dean of girls or dean of boys.
4............School secretary.
5............Guidance counselor.
6............Other; who? ....

C46. What one person in the administration of your school do most teachers see most often about discipline problems?

1............Principal.
2............Vice principal or assistant principal.
3............Dean of girls or dean of boys.
4............School secretary.
5............Guidance counselor.
6............Other; who? ....

C47. What one person in the administration of your school are the teachers **supposed** to see about discipline problems?

1............Principal.
2............Vice principal or assistant principal.
3............Dean of girls or dean of boys.
4............School secretary.
5............Guidance counselor.
6............Other; who? ....

C48. What one person in the administration of your school do most teachers see most often for ordering supplies?

1............Principal.
2............Vice principal or assistant principal.
3............Dean of girls or dean of boys.
4............School secretary.
5............Guidance counselor.
6............Other; who? ....

C49. What one person in the administration do **you** see most often about course content and methodology?

1............Principal.
2............Vice principal or assistant principal.
3............Dean of girls or dean of boys.
4............School secretary.
5............Guidance counselor.
6............Other; who? ....

C50. What one person in the administration do **you** see most often about discipline problems?

1............Principal.
2............Vice principal or assistant principal.
3............Dean of girls or dean of boys.
4............School secretary.
5............Guidance counselor.
6............Other; who? ....

C51. If you had a serious complaint about your job, what would you probably do?

1............Leave the job without talking it over with any administrative member.
2............Submit the complaint to a committee of teachers or administrators.
3............Talk to a member of the administration; who? ....
4............Take it to the superintendent.
5............Keep working without complaint.
6............Other; what? ....

C52. When you need advice on course work or discipline problems, do you:

1............First talk it over with other teachers before going to a member of the administration.
2............Go directly to the member of the administration who you feel is most capable of handling this kind of matter, even though this may not be officially his responsibility.
3............Go directly to the member of the administration who is responsible for handling this kind of matter.

C53. Which one of these statements best describes the school where you teach?

1............Teachers have more voice in running the school than they do in most schools.
2............Teachers have about the same voice in running the school as they do in most schools.
3............Teachers have less voice in running the school than they do in most schools.

C54. In some schools, when teachers have anything to say about the running of the school, only the opinions of an inner circle of teachers count for much. In other schools, most teachers have a fairly equal voice. Which would you say your school is like, in comparison with most schools?

1............Dominated by an inner circle of teachers.
2............Most teachers have an equal voice.

C55. Would you say that you are a member of the inner circle of teachers in your school?

1............I am definitely a member.
2............I am partly a member, but on the outer edge of the circle.
3............I am an outsider.
4............There is no inner circle of teachers in my school.

C56. Which **one** of the following is the single most important thing in determining whether a teacher in your school will be one of the inner circle?

0............There is no inner circle.
1............What the other teachers think of him or her.
2............What the principal thinks of him or her.
3............His or her family's position in the community.

C57. How much competition is there among the teachers in your school for the attention of the principal?

1............Very much.
2............Fairly much.
3............Not much.
4............None.

C58. How well do you like most of the other teachers in your school?

1............Very well.
2............Fairly well.
3............Not much.
4............Not at all.

C59. How similar are you to the other teachers in your school in your values and outlook on life?

1............Similar to most.
2............Similar to about half.
3............Similar to fewer than half.

C60. How often do other teachers ask you for advice about teaching methods or classroom problems?

1............Often.
2............Sometimes.
3............Rarely.
4............Never.

C61. How often do you ask other teachers for advice about teaching methods or classroom problems?

1............Often.
2............Sometimes.
3............Rarely.
4............Never.

C62. Which one of the following things would please you most?

1............To be told by your principal that you are the best teacher in the school.
2............To be voted the best teacher in the school by your fellow teachers.
3............To be told by a lot of your students that you are the best teacher in the school.
4............To be told by a number of parents that you are the best teacher in the school.

C63. Suppose that you were a superintendent and had to choose among three applicants for a single teaching position. If you had nothing else to go on, which one of the following things would you most want to know?

1............What their former principals thought of them.
2............What their former teaching colleagues thought of them.
3............What their former students thought of them.

C64. On the whole, when you size up your success in teaching so far, whose opinions have had the most influence on your estimate of how successful you have been?

1............The opinions of your superiors.
2............The opinions of your fellow teachers.
3............The opinions of your students or their parents.

The questions in this section ask for your opinions about your present principal. Check the appropriate space to show how you would rate your principal on each item.

C65. Allowing teachers freedom on the job:

1............Outstanding.
2............Above average.
3............Average.
4............Below average.

C66. Letting teachers participate in decisions that concern them:

1............Outstanding.
2............Above average.
3............Average.
4............Below average.

C67. Identifying himself and his interests with the teacher group:

1............Outstanding.
2............Above average.
3............Average.
4............Below average.

C68. Being the source of useful new ideas and changes in the school:

1............Outstanding.
2............Above average.
3............Average.
4............Below average.

C69. Supporting and encouraging teachers in new ways of doing things:

1............Outstanding.
2............Above average.
3............Average.
4............Below average.

C70. Communicating his true attitudes and feelings to teachers:

1............Outstanding.
2............Above average.
3............Average.
4............Below average.

C71. Principal's over-all leadership ability·

1............Outstanding.
2............Above average.
3............Average.
4............Below average.

C72. Does your principal get together or talk informally with teachers, or does he confine himself strictly to business?

1............Often associates informally with teachers.
2............Associates informally with teachers from time to time.
3............Rarely associates informally with teachers.
4............Never associates informally with teachers.

C73. Does your principal do classroom teaching besides being principal?

1............Teaches.
2............Does not teach.

C74. Has your principal ever put any pressure on you to do something you felt was wrong, such as changing a grade? If this has happened more than once, answer for the majority of times.

1............No.
2............Yes, but I refused.
3............Yes, and I didn't refuse to his face, but I didn't do what he asked.
4............Yes, I did what he asked.

C75. When you have problems, do you feel free to consult with your principal about them?

1............Feel very free to consult with principal.
2............Feel a little hesitant to consult with principal.
3............Feel very hesitant to consult with principal.

C76. Can the principal be counted on to stand up for the teacher when a parent comes in with a complaint?

1...........Can always be counted on.
2...........Can usually be counted on.
3...........Can sometimes be counted on.
4...........Can hardly ever be counted on.
5...........Can never be counted on.

C77. Can the principal be counted on to stand up for the teacher when a student comes in with a complaint?

1...........Can always be counted on.
2...........Can usually be counted on.
3...........Can sometimes be counted on.
4...........Can hardly ever be counted on.
5...........Can never be counted on.

C78. Is your principal a good disciplinarian?

1...........Outstanding.
2...........Above average.
3...........Average.
4...........Below average.

C79. How many times in an average month do you ask the principal for advice in solving problems or planning your teaching?

0...........Less than once a month.
1...........1 to 3 times a month.
2...........4 to 6 times a month.
3...........7 to 9 times a month.
4...........10 or more times a month.

C80. How often does the principal ask you for advice or for your opinions on school matters affecting you?

0...........Less than once a month.
1...........1 to 3 times a month.
2...........4 to 6 times a month.
3...........7 to 9 times a month.
4...........10 or more times a month.

The factual questions in this section serve for statistical purposes in our analyzing and tabulating the replies.

D6. Sex:

1...........Male.
2...........Female.

D7. Age:

1...........24 or less.
2...........25-29.
3...........30-34.
4...........35-39.
5...........40-44.
6...........45-49.
7...........50-54.
8...........55-59.
9...........60-64.
Y...........65 or more.

D8. Marital status:

1...........Single.
2...........Married, living with husband or wife.
3...........Married, separated from husband or wife.
4...........Divorced.
5...........Widowed.

D9. Religious preference:

1...........Baptist.
2...........Methodist.
3...........Other Protestant.
4...........Roman Catholic.
5...........Jewish.
6...........Other; what? ....

D10. What was your father's (or stepfather's) main job or occupation while you were growing up? (Please be specific so that we can classify the occupation.)

Y ☐ Check here if no father or stepfather was living with you while you were growing up.

D11-12. How many years of education did your parents (or step-parents) complete?

Father D11	Mother D12	
1...........	1	College graduation plus graduate or professional training.
2...........	2	College graduation.
3...........	3	Some college.
4...........	4	High school graduation.
5...........	5	Some high school (10-11 years but did not graduate).
6...........	6	From 6 to 9 years.
7...........	7	Five years or less.

D13. What was the main place where you lived while you were growing up?

1...........North Carolina.
2...........In the South but not North Carolina.
3...........Outside the South.

D14. With whom do you now live? Check the **first answer** which applies.

1...........With my husband or wife.
2...........With my family or with one or more relatives
3...........With another teacher.
4...........With someone who is not a teacher.
5...........I live alone.

IF YOU ARE MARRIED, ANSWER THE FOLLOWING SET OF QUESTIONS. OTHERWISE GO ON TO QUESTION D40.

D15. Please write the present job or occupation of your husband or wife in the space below, in enough detail so that we can classify it.

Y ☐ Check here if your husband or wife is not gainfully employed.

D16. Write the main job or occupation of your husband's or wife's father in the space below, in enough detail so that we can classify it.

D17. How many living children do you have? Circle the correct number.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 or more.

IF YOU HAVE NO CHILDREN, SKIP TO QUESTION D21.

D18. How many children are still living at home with you? (circle.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 or more.

D19. How many **pre-school** children do you have living with you? (Circle.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 or more.

D20. Circle the age of your youngest child, at the child's last birthday.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more.

IF YOU ARE NOT LIVING WITH YOUR HUSBAND OR WIFE, SKIP TO QUESTION D40.

Household duties. In your house, who does each of the things listed below? If neither the husband or wife does one of the things listed, indicate which one would probably do it if either did.

D21. Repairs things around the house:

1............Wife always.
2............Wife a little more.
3............Both the same.
4............Husband a little more.
5............Husband always.

D22. Mows the lawn:

1............Wife always.
2............Wife a little more.
3............Both the same.
4............Husband a little more.
5............Husband always.

D23. Keeps track of the money and the bills:

1............Wife always.
2............Wife a little more.
3............Both the same.
4............Husband a little more.
5............Husband always.

D24. Shops for groceries:

1............Wife always.
2............Wife a little more.
3............Both the same.
4............Husband a little more.
5............Husband always.

D25. Gets the husband's breakfast on work days:

1............Wife always.
2............Wife a little more.
3............Both the same.
4............Husband a little more.
5............Husband always.

D26. Straightens up the living room when company is coming:

1............Wife always.
2............Wife a little more.
3............Both the same.
4............Husband a little more.
5............Husband always.

D27. Does the supper dishes:

1............Wife always.
2............Wife a little more.
3............Both the same.
4............Husband a little more.
5............Husband always.

D28. Has more influence when major decisions involving the whole family are made:

1............Wife always.
2............Wife a little more.
3............Both the same.
4............Husband a little more.
5............Husband always.

D29. When the husband or wife is pressed for time because of a heavy burden of work, do you feel that one of them should perform household tasks that the other usually performs, to help out? Read all the statements below and check the one you agree with most.

1............The wife should do the husband's household tasks when he is pressed for time, but she should not expect him to do hers.
2............The husband should do the wife's household tasks when she is pressed for time, but he should not expect her to do his.
3............Either one should do the other's household tasks when it will help.
4............They should plan their schedules carefully so that neither one will have to do the work of the other, except in very unusual circumstances.

D30. What actually happens in your house when the wife or husband is pressed for time because of a heavy burden of work?

1............The wife sometimes does the husband's household tasks, but he seldom does hers.
2............The husband sometimes does the wife's household tasks, but she seldom does his.
3............Each of them sometimes does the tasks of the other, about equally.
4............The wife and husband have planned their schedules carefully, so that only rarely does either have to do the tasks of the other.

D31. How often do you usually talk with your husband or wife about things that have happened to you at work?

1............Almost every day.
2............Not every day, but more than once a week.
3............Once a week or less.
4............Never.

D32. Which statement best describes the way you really feel about most of your household tasks?

1............I enjoy most household tasks.
2............I don't mind them, but I don't enjoy them either.
3............I dislike them, but consider them necessary.

D33. How often do you do school work at home, such as preparing lessons or grading papers?

1............Several nights a week, and week-ends too.
2............Several nights a week, or week-ends, but not both.
3............Once or twice a week.
4............Less often than this.
5............Never.

D34. If you are behind in school work, and also behind in work around the house, which do you do first?

1............School work, nearly always.
2............School work, usually.
3............House work, usually.
4............House work, nearly always.

D35. Suppose you were already a day late in turning in an important report to your principal, and you also had to do some work around the house to get ready for important guests, but you didn't have time to do them both. Which would you do?

1............Do report for principal, definitely.
2............Do report for principal, probably.
3............Prepare house for important guests, probably.
4............Prepare house for important guests, definitely.

D36. Do you ever feel that there is a conflict between your work as a teacher and your household responsibilities, because of time pressures or for any reason?

1............Serious conflict.
2............Some conflict.
3............Very little conflict.
4............No conflict at all.

MARRIED WOMEN ONLY ANSWER THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS. MEN GO ON TO QUESTION D40.

D37. Do you stay in teaching for the money, or because you like the work?

1............Only for the money.
2............Mainly for the money.
3............Mainly because I like the work.
4............Only because I like the work.

D38. How serious would it be, if your family had to do without the money you earn as a teacher?

1............The family absolutely has to have the money I earn.
2............The family could manage without the money I earn, but this would be a real hardship.
3............There would not be any real hardship if I stopped working, but the family would have to lower its standard of living quite a bit.
4............It would not make much difference in our standard of living if I stopped working.

D39. How does your husband feel about your working?

1............He strongly prefers that I work.
2............He prefers somewhat that I work.
3............He would just as soon have me work or not, as I choose.
4............He would prefer that I not work.

EVERYONE ANSWER FROM HERE ON.

D40. In what kind of place did you spend most of your life while you were growing up?

1............Farm, open country.
2............Small town (up to 2,499).
3............Small city (2,500-9,999, including suburbs).
4............Medium city (10,000-49,999, including suburbs).
5............Big city (50,000-199 999, including suburbs).
6............Very big city (200,000 or more, including suburbs).

If you lived in a suburb, check here ☐ but also check the size of the city above.

D41. In what kind of place did your husband or wife spend most of his or her life while growing up?

1............Farm, open country.
2............Small town (up to 2,499).
3............Small city (2,500-9,999, including suburbs).
4............Medium city (10,000-49,999, including suburbs).
5............Big city (50,000-199 999, including suburbs).
6............Very big city (200,000 or more, including suburbs).

If he or she lived in a suburb, check here ☐ but also check the size of the city above.

D42. How far is the community you now live in from your home town, where you spent most of your childhood?

1............This is my home town.
2............Home town is within one hour's drive from here.
3............Home town is more than one hour's drive from here.

D43. How far is the community you now live in from your husband's or wife's home town?

0............I am not married.
1............This is his or her home town.
2............His or her home town is within one hour's drive from here.
3............His or her home town is more than one hour's drive from here.

D44. Where is your school in relation to where you live?

1............Same neighborhood.
2............Same community but different neighborhood.
3............Different community.

D45. In your community, how active a part are teachers expected to take in community affairs?

1............Much more active than most people.
2............Somewhat more active than most people.
3............Less active than most people.
4............No particular expectation; it is entirely up to the teacher.

D46. How active do you personally feel that teachers should be in community affairs?

1............Much more active than most people.
2............Somewhat more active than most people.
3............Less active than most people.
4............No particular expectation; it is entirely up to the teacher.

D47. Do you feel that teachers should take sides publicly on controversial issues? Which statement best describes your feeling?

1............Teachers are community leaders and should definitely take sides.
2............Teachers have the same right and obligation as other citizens to take sides, but no more.
3............Teachers should represent the whole community, so they should not take sides publicly.

D48. About how many times in an average month (nights, Saturdays, Sundays, etc.) do you get together socially with people other than the people in your own household? Include your visits to them, their visits to you, and times you go out somewhere with them.

1............Less than once a month.
2............1 to 3 times a month.
3............4 to 6 times a month.
4............7 to 9 times a month.
5............10 or more times a month.

D49. When you do get together socially with people other than those in your own household, is it more often with teachers, or with people who are not teachers?

1............Almost always with teachers.
2............More often with teachers.
3............More often with non-teachers.
4............Almost always with non-teachers.

D50. Not counting the people in your own household, think of the three people (or families) in your community with whom you spend the most time in visiting or other social activity. In the spaces below, list **each person's occupation**, or in the case of a family or married couple, list the occupation of the head of the household. Then in the middle column, check whether you are referring to a **single individual** or to a **family or married couple.** Finally, for each one, if you are referring to a family or couple, check the far right-hand column if there is a teacher in the family.

Occupation of Individual or Head of Household	Check Whether Referring to: Individual	Check Whether Referring to: Family	Check if Teacher in Family
1.			
2.			
3.			

D51. Please place **in rank order** the kinds of people listed below with whom you get together socially. Indicate with a '1' the kind of people you get together with most most often, with a '2' the kind of people you get together with next most often, etc. Leave blank any that you never get together with socially, and do not count people in your own household.

RANK KIND OF PEOPLE

1............Relatives.
2............Married couples not related to you.
3............Unmarried men, not related to you.
4............Unmarried women, not related to you.

D52. In the spaces below please list all of the organizations IN YOUR COMMUNITY to which you belong. (Don't include organizations outside your community such as state or national organizations.) Include clubs, church groups, or any other formally organized groups.

Then for each organization, check column A if the organization is one which you possibly would not belong to if you were not a teacher; check column B if you would prefer to be less active in the organization but feel that as a teacher, you are expected to be active; and in column C write the approximate number of hours you spend each month in meetings or other work connected with the organization.

Name or Type of Organization	(A) Check if Might Not Belong if Not a Teacher	(B) Check if Would Prefer to be Less Active	(C) Hours Spent Each Month
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
Y.			

D53. What did you think of this questionnaire?

1............It was very interesting.
2............It was somewhat interesting.
3............It was not interesting.

NOW: 1. **DO NOT** sign the questionnaire.

2. Put it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Seal the envelope.

3. Write your name and the name of your school on the self-addressed post card.

4. Mail **both** the envelope and the post card.

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX B

THE COLLEGE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

COLLEGE STUDENT STUDY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

This is a study of college students, their activities, beliefs, and plans for the future. The study is financed by the United States Office of Education, and conducted by the Institute for Research in Social Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The Office of Education is interested in learning how the educational experiences of college students may affect their career plans.

We are asking thousands of students in different colleges and universities to fill out this questionnaire and return it to us for statistical analysis. Your replies will be completely confidential. Your name does not appear on your questionnaire, and your replies will be used only to compile statistical totals.

Most of the questions can be answered by using check-marks (✓). When you have finished, put your questionnaire in the sealed envelope. The envelope will be opened by research workers in Chapel Hill who will tabulate the answers from the various colleges which are participating in this study. We appreciate your help in making this study a success.

6. What college or university are you attending? (Write the name.)

....

7. In what year of college are you now? (Indicate by check-mark.)

1............Freshman.
2............Sophomore.
3............Junior.
4............Senior.
5............Graduate student.
6............Special or other.

8. Your sex:

1............Male.
2............Female.

9. Age:

1............17 or younger.
2............18.
3............19.
4............20.
5............21.
6............22.
7............23.
8............24-29.
9............30 or older.

10. Marital status:

1............Single.
2............Married, living with husband or wife.
3............Separated, divorced, or widowed.

11. Number of children:

0............Not married or, if married, no children.
1............One child.
2............Two or more children.

12. In what kind of place did you spend most of your life before you first entered college? Guess the size if you are not sure.

1............Farm, open country.
2............Small town (up to 2,499).
3............Small city (2,500-9,999, including suburbs).
4............Medium city (10,000-49,999, including suburbs).
5............Big city (50,000-199,999, including suburbs).
6............Very big city (200,000 or more, including suburbs).

13. What was your father's (or stepfather's) main job or occupation while you were growing up? (Please be specific so that we can classify the occupation.)

Y ☐ Check here if no father or stepfather was living with you while you were growing up.

14-15. How many years of education did your parents (or step-parents) complete?

14. Father:

1............College graduation plus graduate or professional training.
2............College graduation (bachelor's degree).
3............Some college.
4............High school graduation.
5............Some high school (10-11 years but did not graduate).
6............From 6 to 9 years.
7............Five years or less.

15. Mother:

1............College graduation plus graduate or professional training.
2............College graduation (bachelor's degree).
3............Some college.
4............High school graduation.
5............Some high school (10-11 years but did not graduate).
6............From 6 to 9 years.
7............Five years or less.

16. Do you know yet in what subject or field you will major?

1............I am already majoring in something.
2............I have definite plans for my major field.
3............I am not sure what my major field will be.

17. What is your major subject, or your expected major? If your major is a special division of a more general subject, please indicate both: for example, "elementary education" or "business administration—personnel management." Write the major subject in the space below.

Y ☐ Check here if you don't know what your major will be.

18. How many courses have you taken in your major subject, including any that you are taking now? Circle the number.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more
Y ☐ Check here if you don't know what your major will be.

19. Compared with most other college courses you have taken, how interesting have the courses in your major subject been to you?

1............Much more interesting than most.
2............Somewhat more interesting than most.
3............About the same as most.
4............Somewhat less interesting than most.
5............Much less interesting than most.
Y............Haven't taken any yet, or don't know what the major subject will be.

20. What was the single most important consideration, among those listed below, that led you to choose the major subject you did? **Check only one.**

1............It gives training for an occupation I want to go into
2............The subject matter interests me.
3............I had no strong feelings and this field was recommended to me.
4............I can get better grades in this subject than in others.
5............I had no special reason for choosing it, but it seemed as good as any.
Y............I don't know what my major subject will be.

21. If you had it to do over again, would you again choose this same major subject?

1............Yes, definitely.
2............Yes, probably.
3............I don't know.
4............No, probably not.
5............No, definitely not.
Y............I haven't started majoring in anything yet.

22. How do you feel about most people who are majoring in the same subject as you?

1............They are more interesting to be with than the average student.
2............They are about as interesting as the average student.
3............They are less interesting than the average student.
Y............I don't know any of them, or don't know what my major will be.

23. Think of the professors you have had in college. How many of them know you fairly well as a person? Circle the number.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

24. Of these professors who know you fairly well as a person, how many teach in your major subject? Circle the number.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

Y ☐ Check here if you don't know what your major will be.

25. Think of the school teachers you had before college, from the first grade through high school. For how many of them did you feel strong admiration or respect?

0............None of them.
1............Fewer than half of them.
2............More than half of them.
3............All, or nearly all, of them.

26. Do you ever remember thinking that one of your teachers was the kind of person you would like to be as an adult?

1............Yes, very much so.
2............Yes, to some extent or in some respects.
3............No.

27. How much time do you spend studying in an average week day, not counting time spent attending classes? Estimate the nearest number of hours.

1............1 or less.
2............2.
3............3.
4............4.
5............5 or 6.
6............7 or more.

28. In general, do you admire students who do well in their studies?

1............Not at all.
2............A little.
3............Quite a bit.
4............Very much.

29. Do you want to be thought of as a serious student?

1............No, I'd rather not.
2............I don't care.
3............Yes, I'd like to, a little.
4............Yes, I'd like to, very much.

30. How hard do you **really try** to get good grades?

1............Don't try.
2............Try a little.
3............Try quite a bit.
4............Try very hard.

31. Approximately what grade average did you make last semester or quarter?

1............F or D.
2............C—
3............C
4............C+
5............B—
6............B
7............B+
8............A— or A.

32. In college do you usually go around with a close-knit group that does a lot of things together, or do you do different things with different people?

1............Close-knit group.
2............Different things with different people.

33. In the past **week**, how much time have you spent in purely "social" activity with other students of your own sex? Include coffee breaks, sitting and talking, going out at night, playing sports, etc., but **do not include** eating meals together. You probably don't know exactly but make a rough estimate.

0............None.
1............1 to 3 hours (less than ½ hour per day).
2............4 to 6 hours (more than ½ hour but less than 1 hour per day).
3............7 to 13 hours (1 hour or more, but less than 2 hours, per day).
4............14 to 20 hours (2 hours or more, but less than 3 hours, per day).
5............21 hours or more (3 hours or more per day).

34. Estimate roughly how much of this "social" time you spent with one or more students who are majoring in the same subject you are majoring in.

Y ....I am not majoring in anything yet.
0............None of the time.
1............1% to 24% of the time.
2............25% to 49% of the time.
3............50% to 74% of the time.
4............75% to 99% of the time.
5............100% of the time.

35. About how many of your meals do you eat with one or more students who are majoring in the same subject you are majoring in?

Y ....I am not majoring in anything yet.
0............None of my meals.
1............A few of my meals.
2............Fairly many meals but fewer than half of them.
3............Half or more of my meals but not all.
4............All or nearly all of my meals.

36. When you are together with college friends of your own sex, which of the kinds of things listed below do you talk about most often? Write a "1" by the one you talk about most often, a "2" by the one you talk about next most often, and so on down to a "5" by the one you talk about least often.

1-37............Classes, studies.
2-38............Sports.
3-39............Clothes.
4-40............Intellectual topics such as world affairs, books, philosophy, other than course work.
5-41............People you know, campus life, gossip.

42. In the past **four weeks**, how many dates have you had? (Answer for this recent period even if it is not typical.)

Y ....I am married.
If not married:
0............No dates.
1............1, 2, or 3.
2............4, 5, 6, or 7.
3............8 or more.

43. What occupation will you most likely go into when you have finished your education? (Please be as specific as you can so that we can classify the occupation.)

Y ☐ Check here if you have no idea.

44. How certain are you of your intended occupation?

1............Very certain.
2............Not very certain.
3............Undecided, not certain at all.

45. Please place in rank order, in order of how much they influenced your choice of an occupation, any of the following who influenced your decision. Write a "1" by the most influential, a "2" by the second most influential, etc. **Leave blank** any who did not influence you.

Y............I have no idea what my occupation will be.
1-46———A friend, about your own age.
2-47............Father.
3-48............Mother.
4-49............A brother, sister, or other relative.
5-50............A teacher in the first 8 grades.
6-51............A teacher in grades 9-12.
7-52............A professor in college.
8-53............Someone in the intended occupation. (If the intended occupation is teaching, **don't** check here, but check teacher above.)
9............Someone else.
0............None of these influenced me.

54. How many family members or relatives have been in the occupation you expect to enter?

Y..........I don't know what occupation I will enter.
0............None.
1............1.
2............2.
3............3.
4............4 or more.

55. When did you **first consider** going into your intended occupation?

1............6th grade or earlier.
2............7th, 8th, or 9th grade.
3............After 9th grade, but before senior year of high school.
4............Senior year of high school.
5............Freshman year of college.
6............Sophomore year of college.
7............Junior year of college.
8............Senior year of college.
Y..........I have no idea what my occupation will be.

56. When did you **definitely decide** to go into your intended occupation?

1............6th grade or earlier.
2............7th, 8th, or 9th grade.
3............After 9th grade, but before senior year of high school.
4............Senior year of high school.
5............Freshman year of college.
6............Sophomore year of college.
7............Junior year of college.
8............Senior year of college.
Y..........No definite decision yet.

57. Which **one** of the following reasons has had the most influence in your thinking about different occupations you might go into?

1............Income in different occupations.
2............Social standing of different occupations, apart from income.
3............How interesting the work itself is.
4............Opportunity to be of service to people or contribute to society.
5............Advice or urging to enter some occupation, from parents or other people whose advice you respect.

58. How do you feel about most people who go into the occupation you expect to enter?

1............They are more interesting to be with than most people are.
2............They are about as interesting as most people.
3............They are less interesting than most people.
Y..........I don't know any of them, or don't know what occupation I will enter.

59. How do you feel about the occupation you expect to go into?

1............I would rather be going into some other occupation if I could.
2............Several other occupations would suit me as well.
3............One or two other occupations would suit me about as well.
4............No other occupation would suit me as well.
Y..........I don't know what my occupation will be.

60. Think of three of your best friends of your own sex at college. How many of these are majoring (or expect to major) in the same subject as you?

0............None of them.
1............One of them.
2............Two of them.
3............All three of them.
Y..........I have no idea.

61. Of these same three friends, how many expect to go into the same occupation as you?

0............None of them.
1............One of them.
2............Two of them.
3............All three of them.
Y..........I have no idea.

Question 62 is for women only. Men skip to question 63.

62. Assume that you will marry, and that your husband will make enough money so that you will not have to work after marriage unless you want to. Under these circumstances, would you prefer (check only one):

1............to continue working, even after you have children if you have children?
2............to quit working if you have children, but definitely go back to work after the children have grown up and left home?
3............to quit working if you have children, and decide later whether to go back to work after the children have grown up and left home?
4............not to work at all after you marry?

63-66. Imagine yourself ten years from now. For each of the following pairs of activities, check the one which will probably appeal to you more. Guess if you are not sure.

63. 1............Attending a business or professional meeting or convention in a different city.
2............Taking a trip with your family.

64. 1............Reading about ways to improve your proficiency in your work.
2............Reading about ways to improve family life.

65. 1............Talking about your work.
2............Talking about events in your community.

66. 1............Serving on a committee where you work, as part of your job or occupation.

2............Serving in a community organization, such as a civic club or garden club.

Questions 67-72 are for education majors only. Others skip to question B6.

67. Which one of the following statements best describes how you feel about teaching as a career?

1............I want a lifelong career in teaching.
2............I want a career in education, but hope some day to move into school administration and leave classroom teaching.
3............I want to teach for a while, but hope eventually to stop working and be a full-time housewife.
4............I want to teach for a while, but hope eventually to get into a different kind of work.
5............I would prefer not to teach at all.

68. Imagine yourself as a teacher a few years from now. Which one of the following things do you think would please you most?

1............To be told by your principal that you are the best teacher in the school.
2............To be voted the best teacher in the school by your fellow teachers.
3............To be told by a lot of your students that you are the best teacher in the school.
4............To be told by a number of parents that you are the best teacher in the school.

69. Suppose that you were a school superintendent and had to choose among three applicants for a single teaching position. If you had nothing else to go on, which one of the following things would you most want to know?

1............What their former principals thought of them.
2............What their former teaching colleagues thought of them.
3............What their former students thought of them.

70. When a teacher sizes up how well he is succeeding as a teacher, how much weight should he attach to the opinions his students have of him?
Students' opinions should be:

1............The most important single consideration.
2............A very important consideration.
3............A fairly important consideration.
4............Unimportant.

71. When a teacher sizes up how well he is succeeding as a teacher, his fellow teachers' opinions of him should be:

1............The most important single consideration.
2............A very important consideration.
3............A fairly important consideration.
4............Unimportant.

72. When a teacher sizes up how well he is succeeding as a teacher, his principal's opinions of him should be:

1............The most important single consideration.
2............A very important consideration.
3............A fairly important consideration.
4............Unimportant.

Everyone answer the remaining questions.

B-6-B17. These questions ask for your opinion as to how much prestige the teachers of different high school or junior high school subjects have with the general public. Assuming that the teachers are all equally competent, how high would the general standing of each teacher be, just on the basis of the subject he or she teaches? Indicate by checking "1" if the prestige is higher than average, "2" if the prestige is average, and "3" if the prestige is lower than average.

First, suppose that the teacher is a **man**. How much prestige would he have with the general public, **in comparison with most men teachers**, if he teaches each of the subjects below?

	high	average	low
B6. English:	1............	2............	3............
B7. Mathematics:	1............	2............	3............
B8. A foreign language:	1............	2............	3............
B9. Social studies:	1............	2............	3............
B10. Science:	1............	2............	3............
B11. Physical education:	1............	2............	3............

Now, suppose that the teacher is a **woman**. How much prestige would she have with the general public, **in comparison with most women teachers**, if she teaches the following subjects?

	high	average	low
B12. English:	1............	2............	3............
B13. Mathematics:	1............	2............	3............
B14. A foreign language:	1............	2............	3............
B15. Social studies:	1............	2............	3............
B16. Science:	1............	2............	3............
B17. Physical education:	1............	2............	3............

In each of the next three questions, check which you think the general public would have more respect for.

B18. 1............A **man** who teaches the 5th grade.
2............A **woman** who teaches the 5th grade.
3............Same respect for both.

B19. 1............A **man** who teaches high school algebra.
2............A **woman** who teaches high school algebra.
3............Same respect for both.

B20. 1............A **man** who is ambitious to become principal of an elementary school.
2............A **woman** who is ambitious to become principal of an elementary school.
3............Same respect for both.

B21. Regardless of what occupation you plan to enter, imagine yourself as a public school teacher. Place in RANK ORDER, in order of HOW IMPORTANT THEY WOULD BE TO YOU, any of the following aspects of a teacher's job which YOU WOULD LIKE. Indicate with a "1" the thing you would like the most, with a "2" the thing you would like second most, etc. LEAVE BLANK any which you would NOT like about teaching or which would not be important to you.

RANK GOOD ASPECTS OF TEACHER'S JOB

1-B22............Being drawn into a lot of community activities.
2-B23............Spending a lot of time with other teachers.
3-B24............Figuring out ways to deal with problems that arise in class.
4-B25............Spending a lot of time working with children.
5-B26............Being thought of in the community as a teacher.
6-B27............Reading up on the subject matter you teach.

B28. Now place in rank order, in order of how important they would be to you, any of these same things which YOU WOULD DISLIKE about the teacher's job. Leave blank any which you would LIKE or which would not be important to you.

RANK BAD ASPECTS OF TEACHER'S JOB

1-B29............Being drawn into a lot of community activities.
2-B30............Spending a lot of time with other teachers.
3-B31............Figuring out ways to deal with problems that arise in class.
4-B32............Spending a lot of time working with children.
5-B33............Being thought of in the community as a teacher.
6-B34............Reading up on the subject matter you teach.

Do you think that some high school subjects are more appropriate for men or for women to teach? For each subject listed below, check whether you think it is a more appropriate subject for a man to teach, or for a woman to teach, or equally appropriate for both.

	More Appropriate for a Man	**Makes No Difference**	**More Appropriate for a Woman**
B35. English:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B36. Mathematics:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B37. A foreign language:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B38. Social studies:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B39. Science:	1...............	2...............	3...............

Do you think that some occupations are more appropriate for men or for women? For each occupation listed below, check whether you think it is more appropriate for men, or for women, or equally appropriate for both.

	More Appropriate for Men	**Equally Appropriate for Both**	**More Appropriate for Women**
B40. Lawyer:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B41. High school teacher:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B42. Hair stylist:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B43. Physician:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B44. Social worker:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B45. Restaurant cashier:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B46. Librarian:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B47. Elementary school teacher:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B48. Biology lab technician:	1...............	2...............	3...............
B49. College professor:	1...............	2...............	3...............

NOW:

Do not sign your questionnaire.

Place it in the envelope, and seal the envelope.

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX C

LIST OF VARIABLES

There follows a list of variables derived from the teacher and student questionnaires, grouped by general categories. The numbering of variables is not the same as the numbering of questionnaire items. After the number and name of each variable, we indicate the questionnaire item or items it comes from and give explanatory information about its categories and/or the way in which it was derived, if such information seems necessary.

Attributes of Individual Teachers

Basic personal and background data

1. Race, sex, level. Race (white vs. Negro) is derived from the school identification number. (Individual teachers were not identified on the questionnaires, but schools were.) To our knowledge, no desegregation of teaching staffs had occurred in any of the systems studied, so that teachers in Negro schools were assumed to be Negroes, and teachers in white schools were assumed to be whites. Sex is from item B6. Elementary vs. secondary teaching level (grades 1-6 vs. grades 7-12) is from B13 in most cases and probably misclassifies a very small number of teachers. Most teachers indicated what grades they taught. Those who taught more than one grade were classified by the highest grade indicated. Those who did not say what grades they taught were classified on the basis of school identification numbers, which indicated if the schools were elementary or secondary; in this way a small but unknown number of teachers were misclassified as elementary if they taught the seventh or eighth grade in schools labeled elementary in 8-4 school systems. This still left a few teachers who had not indicated what grades they taught and who taught in schools not clearly elementary or secondary, such as consolidated schools spanning all 12 grades. These were defined as secondary if they indicated a subject taught in answering B13, and elementary if they did not; in this way an extremely small but unknown number of teachers of specialized elementary school subjects such as music and physical education were misclassified as secondary. Of the 9668 teachers in the sample, 294 were not classified by variable #1 because they taught in Indian schools or in federally operated schools with racially integrated teaching staffs and therefore could not be classified as white or Negro.

2. North Carolina vs. metropolitan. From school identification number. Through an error in data processing, for which the author is

responsible, the 294 teachers in Indian and federal schools were not classified by this variable when the computer tape was made.

3. Quality of college attended. It was intended that this be obtained from B11, but our estimates of college quality were wholly subjective and the variable was not used in analysis.

4. Amount of education. From B11: not college graduate, bachelor's degree, graduate work beyond bachelor's but no master's, master's, graduate work beyond master's degree.

5. Type of teaching certification. From B12. The categories were applicable only to North Carolina teachers.

6. Number of teaching jobs held. From B13.

7. Subject taught. From B13. Applied only to secondary teachers. Categories are usually humanities (music, art, foreign language, English), mathematics and science, social studies, physical education, other non-academic (shop, home economics, commercial studies). In some tabulations on sex stereotyping, music and art were removed from humanities because the items on stereotyping involve only languages and English. Those listing more than one subject were classified by the first subject listed.

8. Age and years on job. Nine categories from B13 (years in present job: 1 or 2, 3 to 7, 8 or more) and D7 (age: 20's, 30's, 40 or older).

9. Community size, present job. Four categories, metropolitan (from questionnaire identification number) and three North Carolina categories from B13: city (50,000 or more), town (2,500-49,999), rural (2,499 or less, rural). Asking the North Carolina teachers to indicate the community sizes undoubtedly introduced a substantial amount of error, but our own estimates would have been still worse. Many schools were outside the boundaries of cities or towns listed in census data, and we had no way of knowing whether most of these schools were in open country, village, or suburban areas.

10. Age. From D7.

11. Father's occupation. From D10. The usual categories were white collar, agriculture, and blue collar; but smaller categories than these were coded, so that it was possible, for example, to identify respondents whose fathers were teachers or principals and examine them separately from respondents with fathers in other white-collar occupations.

12. Father's occupation. From D11.

13. Community origin. From D40. The usual grouping was 1+2 vs. 3+4 vs. 5 vs. 6, which corresponds roughly to the grouping in variable 9.

Teacher orientations, attitudes, and beliefs

14. Subject matter reading. From C22.

15. Reading index. An index from C21 (reading about education) and C22 (reading about subject matter). On C21, response 3, 4, or 5 gives 2 points, response 2 gives 1 point, response 0 or 1 gives 0 points. On C22, response 5 gives 2 points, response 3 or 4 gives 1 point, response 0, 1, or 2 gives 0 points. Scores for the two items are added to give an index with score range 0 (low) to 4 (high).

16. Attitude toward policy involvement. From B28.

17. Attitude toward professional organizations. From B41.

18. Attitude toward professional self-improvement. From B43.

19. Attitude toward education required of teachers. From B45.

20. Professional zeal index. An index with score range 0 to 6, constructed as follows:

	Score Values and Responses to Items		
Items	Score 2	Score 1	Score 0
B41	1	2	3,4,5
B43	1,2	3	4,5
B45	5	4	3,2,1

21. Concern with student emotional problems. From B49.

22. Humanitarian service orientation. From B53.

23. Holistic service emphasis index. An index with score range 0 to 4, constructed as follows:

	Score Values and Responses to Items		
Items	Score 2	Score 1	Score 0
B49	1	2	3,4,5
B53	1,2	3	4,5

24. Principal should enforce rules. From B37.

25. Bureaucratic submission index. An index with score range 0 (not submissive) to 3 (highly submissive), constructed as follows:

Score Values and Responses to Items

Items	Score 1	Score 0
B31	1,2	3,4,5
B35	1,2	3,4,5
B37	1	2,3,4,5

26. Reason for staying in teaching. From C12, C13, and C14. Teachers were classified by the reasons they ranked first.

27. Status motivation. From C13. Teachers were classified by whether they ranked this reason for staying in teaching 1, 2, or 3, or failed to rank it.

28. Money motivation. From C14. Teachers were classified by whether they ranked this reason for staying in teaching 1, 2, or 3, or failed to rank it.

29. Best aspect of teaching. From B70 through B74. Teachers were classified by the aspects they ranked first.

30. Career vs. community as life interest. From A23.*

31. Career vs. family as life interest. From B9.

32. Central life interest index. An index with score range 0 (low interest in career) to 2 (high interest in career), constructed as follows:

Score Values and Responses to Items

Items	Score 1	Score 0
A23	1	2
B9	1,2,3	4,5,6,7

---

* "A23" means item 23 of the questionnaire. Here and elsewhere, the letter "A" is inserted before the numbers of questionnaire items not preceded by other letters (B, C, D) to distinguish questionnaire item numbers from variable numbers.

33. Occupational reference group index. Constructed as follows from C62, C63, and C64.

Categories	Responses to Items
1	Response 1 to all three items (principal, superiors).
2	Response 1 to any two of the three.
3	Response 2 to all three items (colleagues).
4	Response 2 to any two of the three.
5	Response 3 or 4 to C62 and response 3 to both C63 and C64 (students, parents).
6	Any two of the three responses designated for category 5.
7	All others who responded to all three items.

In analysis the categories were usually grouped with categories 1 and 2 indicating orientation to superiors, 3 and 4 indicating orientation to colleagues, 5 and 6 indicating orientation to clients, and 7 indicating mixed or inconsistent orientations (i.e., one response showing orientation to each of the three kinds of reference groups).

34. Sex stereotypes of teaching. From 35 items, A24 through A58. This is a series of variables, not a single variable.

35. Ideal teacher images and teacher ideologies. This is a miscellany of separate items, many of them also listed elsewhere and given specific names. Topics and items considered relevant to the general idea of teacher images and ideologies include images of ideal teachers (A71 through A76), self-images (A80, B6 through B10), attitudes toward policies and programs (B21 through B25, B27, B55), orientations to bureaucracy, holistic service, and professionalism (B31, B33, B35, B37, B39, B41, B43, B45, B47, B49, B51, B53, B69), and miscellaneous (B57, B58, B67, B70 through B74, D46, D47).

Teacher satisfaction and related variables

36. Shift from initial to present career orientation. Five categories, constructed as follows from A13 and C15:

Changed from uncommitted to committed: 3, 4, or 5 on A13; 1 or 2 on C15.
Stayed committed: 1 or 2 on both A13 and C15.
Stayed uncommitted: 3, 4, or 5 on both A13 and C15.
Changed from committed to uncommitted: 1 or 2 on A13; 3, 4, or 5 on C15.
Retiring soon: 0 on C15, regardless of response to A13.

37. Current job satisfaction. From B80.

y

38. Career satisfaction. From C16.

39. Satisfaction with own teaching quality. From C19.

40. Perceived colleague rating of own teaching quality. From C20.

Evaluations of and relationships with the principal

41. Over-all evaluation of principal. From C71.

42. Principal's authoritarianism index. An index with score range 0 (principal highly authoritarian) to 4 (principal highly democratic), constructed as follows:

	Score Values and Responses to Items		
Items	Score 2	Score 1	Score 0
C65	1	2	3,4
C66	1	2	3,4

42a. Principal's identification with teacher interests. From C67. The fact that the numbers of the preceding variable and this one are 42 and 42a signifies nothing except that two variables were carelessly labeled 42 in early analysis.

43. Principal's backing of teacher against parent. From C76.

44. Principal's rating as disciplinarian. From C78.

45. Principal's normative compliance index. An index with score range 0 (bad) to 2 (good), constructed as follows:

	Score Values and Responses to Items	
Items	Score 1	Score 0
C76	1	2,3,4,5
C78	1,2	3,4

We have taken the concept "normative compliance" from Joy Rochelle Gold's Ph.D. dissertation, "The Effect of Administrative Atmosphere on the Role of the School Teacher," University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1964, pp. 19-22 *et passim*. She surveyed literature on teachers, concluded from it that backing teachers in disputes against parents and maintaining discipline over the pupils are among the strongest normative expectations of principals held by teachers, and coined the term.

46. Principal's backing of teacher index. An index with score range 0 (bad) to 2 (good), constructed as follows:

Score Values and Responses to Items

Items	Score 1	Score 0
C76	1	2,3,4,5
C77	1	2,3,4,5

47. Principal's social distance. From C72.

48. Principal as innovator. From C68.

49. Principal's encouragement of innovation. From C69.

50. Principal's consultation with teachers. From C80.

51. Principal's and teacher's mutual consultation. An index constructed as shown below from C79 and C80. Numbers in cells designate categories.

Responses to C79	Responses to C80				
	0	1	2	3	4
0	4	1	1	1	1
1	3	2	1	1	1
2	3	3	2	1	1
3	3	3	3	2	1
4	3	3	3	3	2

1 = C79 (teacher consults principal) less than C80 (principal consults teacher).
2 = same amount (1, 2, 3, or 4) of consultation in both directions, occurring once a month or more.
3 = C80 (principal consults teacher) less than C79 (teacher consults principal).
4 = both 0 (less than once a month).

52. Principal's enforcement of rules. From B38.

53. Principal should vs. does enforce rules. An index constructed as shown below from B38 and B37. Numbers in cells designate categories describing principal as seen by teacher.

Responses to B38 (does)	Responses to B37 (should)		
	1,2	3	4,5
1,2	1	5	4
3	5	5	5
4,5	3	5	2

1 = bureaucratic-paternal.
2 = relaxed laissez-faire.
3 = weak laissez-faire.
4 = restrictive authoritarian.
5 = other (uninterpretable).

Characteristics attributed by respondent to other teachers in her school or to school as a whole

54. Attributed concern of other teachers with student emotional problems. From B50.

55. Attributed school reward for humanitarian service. From B54.

56. Attributed school holistic service emphasis index. An index with score 0 to 4, constructed from B50 and B54 with responses and scores corresponding to those from B49 and B53, respectively, which were used to construct variable 23.

57. Attributed professional organization activity of other teachers. From B42.

58. Attributed professional self-improvement by other teachers. From B44.

59. Attributed attitude of other teachers toward education required of teachers. From B46.

60. Attributed school professional zeal index. An index with score range 0 to 6, constructed from B42, B44, and B46 with responses and scores corresponding to those from B41, B43, and B45, respectively, which were used to construct variable 20.

Colleague relations

61. Consultation by other teachers. From C60.

62. Mutual colleague consultation index. An index constructed as shown below from C61 and C60. Numbers in cells designate categories.

Responses to C61	Responses to C60			
	4	3	2	1
4	4	1	1	1
3	5	4	1	1
2	5	5	3	1
1	5	5	5	2

1 = teacher is asked for advice by others (C60) more than she asks others for advice (C61).
2 = she is asked, and asks, often.
3 = she is asked, and asks, sometimes.
4 = she is asked, and asks, both rarely or both never.
5 = she asks more than she is asked.

63. Liking of colleagues. From C58.

64. Perceived value similarity of colleagues. From C59.

65. Attraction to colleagues index. An index with score range 0 (bad) to 2 (good), constructed as follows:

Score Values and Responses to Items

Items	Score 1	Score 0
C58	1	2,3,4
C59	1	2,3

66. Willingness of older teachers to help new. From C8.

67. Absence vs. presence of inner circle. From C55.

68. Membership in inner circle. From C55.

69. Inner circle criteria. From C56.

70. Attributed athletic emphasis of school. From B56. This variable should have been given a number to include it with variables 54-60. It is out of place in the list, which of course has no effect on its use.

71. Evaluation of colleagues. From C6.

Student, parent, and community supportiveness; job features

72. Student attitude. From C9.

73. Parents' attitude. From C10.

74. Community attitude. From C11.

75. Job features index. An index with range 0 (bad) to 4 (good) from C6, C9, C10, and C11 (i.e., from variables 71, 72, 73, 74). On each item, response 1 or 2 is given a score value of 1, and response 3 or 4 a score value of 0.

Highly professional teachers

76. The highly professional. To identify a category of hard-core professional teachers, they were defined as highly professional if they possessed all eight of the following characteristics, and not highly professional if they failed to meet any one or more of the eight criteria. The characteristics, identified below by variable and questionnaire item numbers, were that they were moderate or high in the evaluation they placed on their careers as a central life interest; they were heavy readers of professional materials; they had favorable attitudes toward professional organizations, professional self-improvement, and educational requirements for teaching certification; they had stayed in teaching more because of interest in the work than for the money or status it brought them; they were satisfied with teaching as a career; and they planned lifelong careers in teaching or educational administration. Specifically, to be classified as highly professional a teacher had to have given one of the responses designated to all eight of the following questions:

    a. A23: 1, or B9: 1,2,3. Responding in either or both of these ways would give a score of 1 or 2 on variable 32.
    b. Variable 15: scores 3,4.
    c. B41 (variable 17): 1,2.
    d. B43 (variable 18): 1,2.
    e. B45 (variable 19): 4,5.
    f. C12: 1. (This is variable 26.)
    g. C16 (variable 38): 1,2.
    h. C15 (variable 126): 1,2,0. "0" was included to avoid excluding teachers near retirement age from eligibility for classification as highly professional.

    In retrospect, it is clear that this was not the best possible selection of use in designating the highly professional. Variables more directly related to the definition of professionalism in Chapter I would have been preferable.

Family situation

77. Marital status. From D8.

78. Living arrangements. From D14.

79. Spouse's occupation. From D15. The same categories were used as with variable 11 (father's occupation).

80. Children living at home. From D18.

81. Preschool children. From D19.

82. Family situation types. From D6, D7, D8, D17, D18, and D19 the types listed below were derived. "Attached" means married and living with spouse.

a. Men, age 40 and older.
b. Men, age 39 and younger.
c. Women, unattached, age 30 and older.
d. Women, unattached, age 29 and younger.
e. Women, attached, no children, age 30 and older. (Probably won't have children.)
f. Women, attached, no children, age 29 and younger. (Might still have children.)
g. Women, attached, children living but none at home. (Empty nest.)
h. Women, attached, children at home but none of preschool age.
i. Women, attached, preschool children.

It is assumed that most unattached women had no children, though this assumption is undoubtedly not true of some who were separated, divorced, widowed, or, conceivably, single.

83. Husband-wife preponderance in family division of labor. An index with score range 0 (wife did most of the work) to 10 (husband did most of the work). Applied only to those who were married and living with spouse. From D21, D22, D23, D25, D27. On each item, response 1 or 2 (wife) gave a score value of 0, response 3 (both the same) gave a score of 1, and response 4 or 5 (husband) gave a score of 2.

84. Conventional vs. deviant family division of labor. An index from D21, D22, D25, and D27, applied only to those married and living with spouse. Conventional responses are:

D21: 4,5 (husband)
D22: 4,5 (husband)
D25: 1,2 (wife)
D27: 1,2 (wife)

All other responses are deviant. Categories are:

a. Conventional on all four.
b. Deviant toward wife; i.e., deviant on D21 and/or D22 but conventional on D25 and D27.
c. Deviant toward husband; i.e., deviant on D25 and/or D27 but conventional on D21 and D22.
d. Innovative: deviant toward each spouse on at least one item; i.e., deviant on D21 and/or D22 and also deviant on D25 and/or D27.

85. Division of labor in specific tasks. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. Seven separate items: D21, D22, D23, D24, D25, D26, D27.

86. Family power. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. From D28.

87. Attitude toward family mutual aid. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. From D29.

88. Family mutual aid. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. From D30.

89. Talk with spouse about work. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. From D31.

90. Enjoy housework. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. From D32.

91. Schoolwork at home. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. From D33.

92. Schoolwork vs. housework, which do first. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. From D34.

93. Principal's report vs. house guests. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. From D35.

94. School vs. home task primacy index. An index from D34 and D35, applied only to those married and living with spouse, with score range 0 (home) to 2 (school). On each item, response 1 gave a score value of 1 and any other response gave a score value of 0. Thus low scores do not necessarily mean that home tasks were given primacy; they mean only that school tasks were not always or definitely given primacy when the two were in conflict.

95. Role conflict. Applied only to those married and living with spouse. From D36.

96. Married women, work for money vs. like the work. Applied only to women married and living with spouse. From D37.

97. Married women, family need for earnings. Applied only to women married and living with spouse. From D38.

98. Husband's attitude toward wife's working. Applied only to women married and living with spouse. From D39.

Community and social participation

99. Distance from childhood home. From D42.

100. Distance from home to work. From D44.

101. Community expectation for participation. From D45.

102. Attitude toward community participation. From D46.

103. Relation of community to own participation preference. Derived from D45 and D46 as shown below. Those giving response 3 to either question were excluded. Numbers in cells designate categories.

Responses to D45	Responses to D46 1,2	4
1,2	1	3
4	2	4

1 = community and teacher both prefer activity.
2 = community does not care, teacher prefers activity.
3 = community prefers activity, teacher prefers freedom.
4 = community does not care, teacher likes this freedom.

104. Attitude toward controversial activity. From D47.

105. Social participation: amount. From D48.

106. Occupational community. From D49.

107. Teachers in friends' families. From D50.

108. Local voluntary association memberships (number belonged to). From D52, number listed in first column.

109. Time spent in local voluntary associations. From D52, total hours listed in column C. Categories: none, 1-2, 3-4, 5-9, 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-49, 50 or more.

110. Local associations belonged to because teacher. From D52, number checked in column A.

111. Extreme occupational community index. Two categories, extreme occupational community vs. everyone else. Teachers with extreme occupational community were defined as those either married to teachers or principals (from D15) or, if unattached, living with teachers (D14: 3) who also spent most of their social time with teachers (D49: 1,2).

112. Community facilities quartile. Data for this variable were not obtained from the questionnaire but from official records obtained from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction for a study conducted by Charles E. Bowerman, Ernest Q. Campbell, and M. Richard Cramer, to whom we are indebted for letting us use their data. On the basis of 1959-1960 per pupil expenditures of their city or county school systems, all white schools were arrayed from highest to lowest. The same was done separately for Negro schools. Where separate data were not available for white and Negro schools in a given city or county, both were assigned the same per pupil expenditure--probably a fairly reasonable procedure when 1959-1960 expenditures were involved, though it would have been very unreasonable for expenditures 10 or 15 years earlier. Indian and federal schools were excluded from this analysis. White and Negro schools, separately, were then divided into categories which would be, as nearly as possible, quartiles for each race. It was not possible to divide them exactly into quartiles, since all schools in a given city or county had the same value and there were therefore many tied schools which overlapped two quartiles. In such cases, schools were assigned to the lower of the two quartiles they overlapped: to quartile 2 rather than 1, 3 rather than 2, or 4 rather than 3. Teachers were then classified by the quartiles of their schools. A substantial amount of error doubtless resulted from the assumption that all schools in a given school system had the same per pupil expenditures and that the expenditures were the same in Negro and white schools in the systems for which separate data for Negro and white schools were not available, but these assumptions were necessary because no better data could be had. Metropolitan teachers were not included in this procedure but were kept as a separate category.

113. Community facilities and size halves. From B13 and variable 112. Metropolitan teachers were kept as a separate category. North Carolina teachers were classified from B13 as working in big communities (population 10,000 or more) or little communities. From variable 112, they were defined as teaching in communities with good facilities (quartiles 1,2) or bad facilities (quartiles 3,4). This procedure resulted in five categories: metropolitan teachers, and North Carolina teachers in big communities with good facilities, in big communities with bad facilities, in little communities with good facilities, and in little communities with bad facilities.

Occupational choice and related factors

114. Age first considered teaching. From A6.

115. Age definitely decided to teach. From A7.

116. Other occupations considered. From A8. Three categories: Professions with higher status than teaching, other occupations, no other occupations considered.

117. First-ranked personal influence on occupational choice. From A9. Responses were grouped thus: 2+3+4 (family) vs. 5+6+7 (teacher or professor) vs. 1+8 (other nonfamily) vs. Y (no influence).

118. Reason for deciding to become a teacher. From A10. Responses were grouped thus: 4 (interesting work) vs. 1 (career and family) vs. 2+3 (income, advancement) vs. 5+6 (negative).

119. Number of teachers in childhood family. From A11.

120. Influence of teachers in family on occupational choice. From A12.

121. Initial career commitment. From A13.

122. Undergraduate friends who went into teaching. From A14.

123. Professors known well. From A15.

124. Education professors known well. From A16.

125. Attended teacher's vs. non-teacher's college. From B11, last place attended. Since this variable was constructed from cards with only the last college attended punched in them, it was applied only to respondents who had received no education beyond the bachelor's degree. Otherwise, some teachers would have been classified on the basis of their graduate schools rather than undergraduate schools. In some instances, mainly involving metropolitan teachers, coders had to guess whether an institution was a teacher's college, and some error presumably resulted from this necessity; but probably not much, for it was known which institutions in the two states sampled and in neighboring states were (or had been until recently) teacher's colleges in fact, whether or not they remained so in name.

Career orientations and career types

126. Future career commitment. From C15. A few men who said that they planned to become housewives were regarded as not having answered the question.

127. Reason for changing positions. From B20.

Career patterns and career situations

128. Beginners vs. veterans. Three categories, from B13 and D7. "Beginners" had held no previous teaching jobs and were in the first year of their current jobs. "Young veterans" were nonbeginners 24 years old and younger. All others, except a few for whom the data used in classifying beginners and young veterans were missing, were "older veterans."

129. Studied continuously vs. left school to work. From B15. Two categories, those giving response "0" vs. all others who answered the question.

130. Summer jobs during college years. From B16.

131. Part-time jobs during college academic years. From B17.

132. Orderly vs. disorderly career: interruption of teaching by other kinds of jobs, yes or no. From B18.

133. Orderly vs. disorderly career: interruption of teaching by other kinds of jobs, how many. From B19.

Miscellaneous variables not elsewhere classified

134. Self-image: warm vs. cold. From A80.

135. Self-image: frustrated vs. contented. From B6.

136. Self-image: boring vs. interesting. From B7.

137. Self-housewife comparison: warm vs. cold. Applied to women only. A cross-tabulation of A77 and A80 with three categories: self warmer, same, housewife warmer.

138. Self-housewife comparison: frustrated vs. contented. Applied to women only. A cross-tabulation of A78 and B6 with three categories: self more contented, same, housewife more contented.

139. Self-housewife comparison: boring vs. interesting. Applied to women only. A cross tabulation of A79 and B7 with three categories: self more interesting, same, housewife more interesting.

140. Community size mobility. From B13, a cross-tabulation of size of community of first teaching job and present job, with four categories: present community bigger, same, first community bigger, this is first job. Applied to North Carolina teachers only, because we had no community size category larger than that of the metropolis we studied.

141. Advise son to be a teacher. From C17.

142. Advise daughter to be a teacher. From C18.

143. Perceived home guard. From C30, classified by whether the item was checked or not.

144. Teacher voice in running school. From C53. This should have been numbered in the sequence with ratings of the principal.

145. Principal's illegitimate demands. From C74. This should have been numbered in the sequence with ratings of the principal.

146. Feeling about the questionnaire. From D53.

(There are no variables with numbers from 147 to 159.)

160. Subject vs. child orientation of ideal woman high school teacher. From A72.

161. Subject vs. child orientation of ideal woman elementary teacher. From A75.

162. Subject vs. child orientation: self-description. From B8.

163. Working with other teachers on committees: like vs. dislike. From B61.

164. Perceived social class of students. From C25.

165. Days attending professional meetings. From C23. Coded 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 or more.

School Attributes

Teachers were classified into quartiles on the basis of a number of attributes of their schools, most of the attributes being measured by aggregated questionnaire responses of the teachers in each school. The method was similar to that used to obtain variable 112, except that metropolitan and North Carolina teachers were combined in the same classification. Appendix D describes the method used to classify school attributes and lists the school attribute variables. All teachers were classified by variable 147S, a quartile distribution of schools arrayed by the numbers of teachers on their staffs, including both respondents and nonrespondents to the questionnaire, and by variable 148S, a quartile distribution of schools arrayed by the percentages of their teachers who returned questionnaires. The remaining school attribute variables were assigned to only some of the teachers, as is explained in Appendix D.

These variables were quartile distributions of schools arrayed by the percentages of their teachers who gave certain responses to questionnaire items or had certain scores on indexes.

Below are indicated the item responses or index score values, as the case may be, from which these percentages were obtained for each school attribute variable. For example, 10S was based on the array of schools by percentages of their teachers who gave any of the designated responses indicating that they were "old" (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, Y); 20S was based on the array of schools by percentages of their teachers with either of the designated index scores (5 or 6); and so on. When a teacher did not answer the question used to derive a given school attribute variable, she was not included in the percentage base in calculating her school's percentage of teachers giving the designated responses.

3S. Quality of college attended. B11: percent from high-quality colleges.
4S. Amount of education. B11: percent with graduate work.
10S. Age: percent old. D7: 5+6+7+8+9+Y.
14S. Subject matter reading. C22: 4+5.
15S. Reading index. Variable 15: 3+4.
16S. Policy involvement. B28: 1.
20S. Professional zeal index. Variable 20: 5+6.
23S. Holistic service emphasix index. Variable 23: 4.
25S. Bureaucratic submission index. Variable 25: 2+3.
33S. Colleague reference group orientation. Variable 33: 3+4.
37S. Current job satisfaction. B80: 1+2.
38S. Career satisfaction. C16: 1.
41S. Over-all evaluation of the principal. C71: 1+2.
42S. Principal's authoritarianism index. Variable 42: 3+4.
45S. Principal's normative compliance index. Variable 45: 2.
46S. Principal's backing of teacher index. Variable 46: 2.
47S. Principal's social distance. C72: 1 (not distant).
48S. Principal as innovator. C68: 1+2.
49S. Principal's encouragement of innovation. C69: 1+2.
50S. Principal's consultation of teachers. C80: 1+2+3+4.
52S. Principal's enforcement of rules. B38: 1.
56S. Attributed school holistic service index. Variable 56: 3+4.
60S. Attributed school professional zeal index. Variable 60: 4+5+6.
61S. Consultation by other teachers. C60: 1.
65S. Attraction to colleagues index. Variable 65: 2.
67S. Absence of inner circle. C55: 4.
71S. Evaluation of colleagues. C6: 1+2.
72S. Student attitude. C9: 1+2.
73S. Parents' attitude. C10: 1+2.
74S. Community attitude. C11: 1+2.
75S. Job features index. Variable 75: 2+3+4.

79S. Women teachers' husbands' occupations. D15: white collar among women married and living with husbands, but others were also given their schools' classifications.

100S. Distance from home to work. D44: 1+2.

101S. Community expectation for participation: activity expected. D45: 1+2.

104S. Attitude toward controversial activity. D47: 3.

106S. Occupational community. D49: 1+2.

110S. Local associations belonged to because teacher. D52: percent checking one or more in column A. On this item, unlike others, those who left the question blank were included in the percentage base, since leaving the question blank was the way in which they were to indicate, if they belonged to no organizations.

126S. Future career commitment. C15: 1+2 as percent of 1+2+3+4+5.

F126S. Future career commitment of women teachers in school. C15: 1+2 as percent of 1+2+3+4+5 among women teachers only; but the men were also classified by the variable although it was based on the responses of women.

143S. Perceived home guard. C30: 1.

144S. Teacher voice in running school. C53: 1.

149S. Percent of respondents male. D6: 1.

150S. Home guard: percent oldtimers. B13: percent who had been in current job eleven years or longer. Cf. 152S.

152S. Turnover. B13: percent who had been in current job three or fewer years. Cf. 150S. This is a faulty measure of turnover since we have no way of knowing, when a school had a high percentage of newcomers, whether this was because of rapid expansion of staff size or constant staff size with many people coming and going, and the latter is what "turnover" usually refers to.

162SE. Subject vs. child orientation, elementary schools. B8: 1+2+3+4 (subject-oriented or neutral). This variable was applied to North Carolina schools clearly identified as elementary. North Carolina consolidated and secondary schools and all metropolitan schools were excluded from analysis of it.

162SS. Subject vs. child orientation, secondary schools. B8: 1+2+3 (subject-oriented). This variable was applied only to North Carolina schools clearly identified as secondary. North Carolina consolidated and elementary schools and all metropolitan schools were excluded from analysis of it. The reason for obtaining separate distributions based on different cutting points for elementary and secondary teachers was that elementary teachers tended to be much less subject-oriented and more child-oriented than secondary teachers. A single array including both elementary and secondary schools would have placed nearly all secondary schools in higher quartiles than nearly all elementary schools.

164S. Perceived social class of students. C25: 1+2+3 (high).

165S. Days attending professional meetings. C23: 5 or more.

Attributes of Individual College Students

The numbers of these are not in sequence, because variables corresponding to teacher variables were given the same numbers (with "C" added to indicate that they were student variables), and there were a large number of teacher variables with no corresponding student variables and a lesser number of student variables with no corresponding teacher variables.

Basic personal and background data

1C. Race and sex. Race is from the identification number of the questionnaire, which indicated the predominant race of the student body of each college or university. A very small amount of racial desegregation of North Carolina college student bodies had occurred at the time of the study, nearly all of it involving Negro students attending previously all-white institutions rather than the other way around, and most of it involving graduate and professional students rather than undergraduates. Probably well under 1% of our respondents were misclassified by assigning them the predominant racial classifications of their institutions, all or nearly all of these being Negro students attending predominantly white colleges. Sex is from A8.

3C. College attended. Each college had a separate questionnaire identification number, from which it could be classified by such things as race, size of student body, and subjectively estimated quality if the need arose.

7C. Field of teaching preparation. Applied to education majors only. From A68 and A17. Those who gave any answer to A68 were regarded as education majors. Their fields of preparation were obtained from A17, coded as follows: elementary education; social sciences; mathematics and natural sciences; business administration; humanities; history; nursing; engineering or architecture; secretarial, commercial science, and other vocational business-related subjects other than business administration; agriculture, forestry, and related subjects; physical education; other. The most frequent grouping of these in analysis was elementary education, humanities, mathematics and science, social science and history, physical education, other.

201C. Major subject. Same information and coding procedures as for 7C, from A17, but applied to all students rather than only to education majors.

202C. Education career planners vs. education non-career planners vs. non-education majors. From A68 and A67. Education students were defined as those who gave any answer to A68; others were defined as non-education. Of the education students, those giving response 1 or 2 to A67 were defined as career planners and the rest as non-career planners. The reason for defining education majors as those who answered A68 rather than as those who answered A67, in creating this variable and the two preceding ones, was the unproved assumption that some non-education students might carelessly answer 67, than realize their mistake and not answer A68.

10C. Age. From A9.

11C. Father's occupation. From A13. The same categories were used as in classifying teachers' fathers' and spouses' occupations (variables 11 and 79).

12C. Father's education. From A14.

203C. Mother's education. From A15.

13C. Community origin. From A12.

77C. Marital status. From A10.

80C. Number of children. From A11.

204C. Year in college. From A7. Respondents other than freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors were excluded from the analysis sample.

Orientations, attitudes, and beliefs.

33C. Occupational reference group index. The measurement of this was similar to that of 33 on teachers, except that items A70, A71, and A72 were treated as a single ingredient in the index in obtaining 33C. Respondents who answered "1" to more than one of these three items, or to none of them, were excluded from analysis. For those who were left, response 1 to A72 was taken to indicate orientation to the principal; response 1 to A71, orientation to colleagues; and response 1 to A70, orientation to students. Responses 1, 2, and 3 to A69 and 1, 2, and 3 or 4 to A68 were taken as indicators of orientations to the principal, to colleagues, and to students or parents, respectively. The three indicators were then combined, as in obtaining variable 33, into seven categories. Respondents with two or three principal-oriented indicators were classified as principal-oriented, those with two or three colleague-oriented indicators were classified as colleague-oriented, and those with two or three indicators of orientation to students or parents were classified as having this orientation. Respondents with one indicator showing orientation to each of the three reference groups were classified as having mixed or inconsistent orientations.

34C. Sex stereotypes of teaching. Twenty-two separate variables from B6 through B20, B35 through B39, B41, B47.

205C. Sex stereotypes of nonteaching occupations. Eight separate variables, from B40, B42, B43, B44, B45, B46, B48, B49.

35C. Best aspect of teaching. From item B21, response categories B22-B27, aspect ranked first.

Occupational choice and related factors

114C. Age first considered intended occupation. From A55.

115C. Age definitely decided on intended occupation. From A56.

206C. How certain of intended occupation. From A44.

207C. Intended occupation. From A43. Code categories were (0) medicine, law, dentistry, college professor, (1) engineering, architecture, (2) natural scientist, mathematician, programming and computing, (3) social scientist, (4) nursing, social work, clergy and church-related occupations, medical and health technicians, librarians, (5) journalism and related occupations, drama, arts, communications, public relations, (6) business: administrative, managerial, financing, proprietor, personnel, fashion merchandising, (7) government work, secretarial, clerical, real estate, sales promotion, (8) agriculture, forestry, etc., (9) teaching, school administration, (X) other: e.g., military officer, airline hostess, diet therapist, home demonstrator, (Y) have no idea. The basis for this classification was a mixture of theoretical and logical considerations and inspection of the kinds of vocational preparation programs offered in the colleges and universities being studied.

117C. First-ranked personal influence on occupational choice. From A45.

118C. Value influence on occupational choice. From A57.

119C. Relatives in intended occupation. From A54.

208C. Reason for choice of major subject. From A20.

209C. Would respondent choose same major subject again? From A21.

121C. Teaching career commitment. From A67. Non-education majors--those who failed to answer A68--were excluded from analysis.

123C. Professors known well. From A23.

124C. Professors in major subject known well. From A24.

Miscellaneous aspects of undergraduate education

125C.Teacher's vs. non-teacher's college. From school identification number.

210C.Number of courses taken in major subject. From A18.

211C.Enjoyment of courses in major subject. From A19.

212C.Feeling about people majoring in same subject. From A22.

213C.Admiration for school teachers. From A25.

214C.Teacher as role model. From A26.

215C.Hours of daily study. From A27.

216C.Admiration for good students. From A28.

217C.Desire to be thought of as serious student. From A29.

218C.Effort for good grades. From A30.

219C.Grade point average. From A31.

220C.Close-knit group. From A32.

221C.Amount of social activity. From A33.

222C.Social time with majors in same subject. From A34.

223C.Meals with majors in same subject. From A35.

224C.Friends majoring in same subject. From A60.

111C.Extreme educational community index. An index with two categories, those with extreme educational community vs. all others who answered questions A34, A35, and A60. Respondents with extreme educational community were defined as those giving one of the designated answers to all three questions. Designated responses were as follows. A34: 3,4,5. A35: 3,4. A60: 2,3. To answer in these ways meant that they spent half or more of their social time with students majoring in the same subject as themselves, ate half or more of their meals with such students, and reported that two or all three of their three best friends were majoring in the same subjects as themselves. Respondents who failed to answer, or answered "Y", to any of the three questions were excluded from analysis.

122C. Friends going into same occupation. From A61.

225C. Topics of social conversation. Five variables, from A37 through A41.

226C. Frequency of dating. From A42. Applied to unmarried students only.

227C. Feeling about people going into same occupation. From A58.

228C. Anticipated career enthusiasm. From A59.

229C. Women's career plans. From A62. Men were asked to skip the question, and the few who answered it were excluded from tabulations.

230C. Elementary vs. secondary education majors. From A68 and A17. Respondents who answered A68 were defined as education majors. Of these, from A17, those who indicated that their major was elementary education were designated elementary education majors, and all others were designated secondary education majors. This procedure may have misclassified a small number of respondents, but no better way to get the classification was available, since students preparing to teach in secondary schools may indicate a variety of subject matter specialties of their majors.

College Attributes

These variables are contextual measures analogous to the school context measures described in Appendix D, except that halves instead of quartile arrays of colleges were used because the number of colleges was so small. Response rate was not a consideration as it was with teachers; all colleges could be used in this analysis. To categorize the colleges as high or low, they were not ranked as was done with schools, but were defined as high on a variable if higher percentages of their students than of students in the entire sample gave the designated responses. As was done in assigning school attribute measures to teachers, each student was assigned for each variable the designation, high or low, of his institution on that variable. The variables and designated responses or other sources of data follow.

CA301. Percent of students who were education majors. From variable 201C. Registrars at the colleges were asked for this information, but few were able to supply it, so we used the questionnaire responses of our sample.

CA302. Percent of education majors who were male. From 201C and A8.

CA303. Percent of students who were education majors: men and women separately. This differs from CA301 in that each student was classified, for CA303, by the percentage of his college's students of his own sex only who were education majors. The idea is that students of one's own sex may be the main reference group for many purposes, and a male student (for example) might attend a predominantly female college with a large number of education majors, but be relatively uninfluenced by the education major subculture if a low percentage of the few men in the college are education majors.

CA304. Percent of education majors who were career planners: men and women separately. A67: 1+2. Men and women were classified separately in the same way and for the same reason as in classifying them on CA303.

CA215. Hours of daily study. A27: 5+6.

CA217. Desire to be thought of as serious student: men and women separately. A29: 4.

CA230. Secondary education majors as percent of all education majors: men and women separately. From variable 230C.

APPENDIX D

THE METHOD OF CLASSIFYING SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS FOR CONTEXTUAL AND SCHOOL-AS-UNIT ANALYSIS

A fundamental assumption of sociologists is that how an individual thinks and behaves is conditioned by how others around him think and behave. Sometimes others exert direct pressure on him to conform; they tell him what he ought to think or to do. At other times the pressure on him is less direct; he perceives how others think and act, and assumes that they expect him to think and act similarly, or he may imitate others because he thinks that they are wiser or more experienced than he is, whether or not he feels any moral pressure to do so.

It is through an individual's perception of the behaviors, beliefs, and norms of others in his group that the group exerts its influence on him. Therefore sociologists sometimes ask the individual, directly, what he thinks the group's attitudes and behaviors are, and what he thinks the group expects of him. We have done this in some of our questionnaire items. But group pressures are sometimes so subtle that the individual is not conscious of them. In these instances, to measure the prevailing behaviors and attitudes themselves is a better way to observe group influence on the individual than to ask him about them directly is.

Suppose that in examining some attitude as a dependent variable, we find that two individuals who differ with respect to the attitude are alike with respect to various personal characteristics which have been found related to it, but belong to different groups, in which the prevailing attitudes are different. It is reasonable in this situation to assume that the two individuals differ in their attitudes because their groups have exerted different kinds of influences on them, although we have not directly observed the process of influence.

Sociologists commonly refer to this kind of inference, in which individuals' attitudes or behaviors are the dependent variables and properties of the groups to which they belong are the independent variables, as "contextual analysis," a term introduced by Lazarsfeld and his associates at Columbia University.[1] Any property of the group can be used as a contextual independent variable, and in our study we have used several kinds of school characteristics in this way, to explain attitudes and behaviors of individual teachers within the schools. Examples are the size of the community in which the school was located (variables 9, 113), the per-pupil expenditure in the school system in which the school was located (112, 113), the number of teachers in the school (147S), the percentage of them who returned usable questionnaires (148S), and whether the school was an elementary or secondary school, predominantly white or Negro (1S). (This last is both a contextual and an individual variable in our sample, since all teachers in Negro elementary schools were themselves Negroes and elementary teachers, and so on; no racial integration of teaching staffs had yet taken place in the schools we studied.)

---

[1] For discussions of varieties of contextual variables and techniques of contextual analysis, see Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Herbert Menzel, "On the Relation between Individual and Collective Properties," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961, pp. 422-440; Allen H. Barton, Organizational Measurement and Its Bearing on the Study of College Environments, New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1961. One of the earliest studies to make extensive use of contextual analysis with the contextual properties defined as aggregated individual properties of group members was Hanan C. Selvin, The Effects of Leadership, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960, based on a 1956 Ph.D. dissertation at Columbia University.

In the examples just given, school context measures were readily available for every teacher in our sample. Most of our contextual variables, however, were of the kind exemplified in our earlier discussion of the general logic of contextual analysis: ascertaining the prevailing climates of opinion or patterns within different schools so as to observe influences of these on individual teachers. In doing this, a large amount of error would be introduced if we inferred a group atmosphere from the responses of a small and not necessarily representative number of a school's teachers. To reduce this error, we calculated school context measures based on aggregated responses of a school's individual teachers only if the school met two criteria: it had to have five or more teachers, and 50% or more of its teachers had to have returned usable questionnaires. Thus the minimum number of teachers used to classify any school was three, and in most cases there were considerably more than three teachers and a response rate well in excess of 50%. The application of our two criteria for inclusion reduced the number of schools used in most of our contextual analysis to 472, and the number of teachers to 5330, the average number of respondents being 11.3 in the schools included in the analysis.

The exclusion of schools with low response rates reduced the kind of error we were trying to guard against but did not eliminate it altogether. Some schools were doubtless misclassified because their teachers who returned our questionnaire were different from those who did not. To the extent that such misclassifications introduce random errors into our cross-tabulations of variables, their effect is to obscure relationships which actually exist, more often than to create the appearance of relationships which do not exist. Since we are like other research investigators in preferring to find relationships rather than what are contemptuously labeled "negative results," i.e., no relationships, it can be said that misclassifications of schools due to nonresponse of some of their teachers tend to work against us, introducing conservatism into our analysis and operating against false claims of discovery.

Our procedure for classifying school contexts on the basis of response patterns of their teachers was as follows. First, for each school with respect to each variable, we computed the percentage of teachers who gave some designated response to a questionnaire item or who had some designated score on a multi-item index. For example, to classify school "reading index" contexts (variable 15S), we computed the percentage of teachers in each school who had index scores of 3 or 4. The designated responses for other contextual variables are indicated in our List of Variables, Appendix C.

Second, we arrayed the schools in order of the percentages of their teachers who had given the designated responses, eliminating any school from a given array if fewer than three of its teachers had responded to the item in question. This item-by-item elimination reduced the numbers of schools classified by some of these contextual variables to fewer than 472.

Third, for each variable we divided the schools into four quartiles, choosing cutting points in the array of school percentages which would divide the schools into four groups containing as nearly equal numbers of schools as possible. The ideal or hypothetical number of schools in each quartile would be 118 if 472 schools met the criteria for inclusion in the contextual analysis of a given variable, it would be 117.25 if only 469 schools met the criteria, and so on. For most variables the numbers of schools in the four quartiles were not identical, because a number of schools might be tied at the hypothetical percentage cutting point and thus overlap two quartiles, and in such cases we assigned them all to one or the other quartile. Thus what we have are not true quartiles although we use this term to refer to them.

Variable 16S provides an example of the procedure we used to assign schools which overlapped two quartiles to one or the other of them. There were 471 schools qualified for inclusion in the contextual analysis of this variable. Therefore each quartile should hypothetically contain 117.75 schools. The cutting point between quartiles 1 and 2 on this variable was 50.0% of a school's teachers giving the designated response. In 99 schools, more than 50.0% of the teachers gave the designated response, and in 35 schools, exactly 50.0% gave this response. To place these 35 schools in quartile 1 would give it 134 schools, or 16.25 more than the hypothetical number, 117.75. To place the 35 tied schools in quartile 2 would give quartile 1 only 99 schools, a larger deviation (18.75) from the ideal figure of 117.75. We therefore put the 35 tied schools all in quartile 1, since this produced the lesser of the two possible deviations from the 117.75 schools which the quartile hypothetically should have included. The same lesser-deviation principle was used to assign tied schools which overlapped quartiles 2 and 3 or 3 and 4.

Sometimes tied schools overlapped two quartiles and their assignment to one or the other would produce identical deviations from the hypothetical dividing point. For example, suppose that 468 schools qualify for contextual analysis of a variable, so that each quartile ideally should contain 117 schools. Suppose further that the cutting point between quartiles 1 and 2 is 70.0% of a school's teachers giving the designated response, that in 115 schools more than 70.0% give this response, and that in four schools exactly 70.0% give this response. To place these four schools in quartile 1 would give it 119 schools, and to place them in quartile 2 would leave 115 schools in quartile 1. Either solution would involve a deviation of 2 from the hypothetical number of 117 schools the quartile should contain, so that our lesser-deviation principle described in the preceding paragraph is of no help. In such cases we assigned the tied schools to the lower of the two quartiles they overlapped: to quartile 2 rather than 1, 3 rather than 2, or 4 rather than 3. It was necessary to apply this arbitrary procedure in only eight of 144 instances (48 variables with three quartile dividing points each), and in none of the eight instances were more than six tied schools involved.

Having thus assigned the schools to quartiles on each variable, we then assigned each teacher, for each variable, the quartile into which her school fell, for analysis in which teachers were categorized by the contextual characteristics of the schools where they taught. The school quartile measures were also used in analysis with the 472 schools rather than their 5330 teachers as the units of analysis.

The reader may wonder why we assigned quartiles instead of simply dividing all schools on all variables at some arbitrarily chosen figure, such as 50% vs. fewer than 50% of their teachers giving designated responses. The advantage of the quartile procedure is that it approximately equalizes the numbers of schools defined as high and low on our variables, so as to allow the use of controls in cross-tabulation without shrinking the cell sizes too much. This is an especially important consideration when schools rather than individual teachers are the units of analysis, since the total number of schools classified by most of our contextual variables is 472 or fewer.

The medians of the school percentage distributions--i.e., the dividing points between quartiles 2 and 3--are often not very close to 50% of the teachers giving the designated responses. This fact has the unfortunate effect that the range of percentages within a given quartile is sometimes rather small, so that schools are classified as different although they do not differ by very much. But this situation was unavoidable, because in many cases the designated responses used to assign quartiles were chosen on a logical basis rather than on the basis of inspecting the distributions of responses, and in other cases the distributions were such that no dichotomy would place roughly half the teachers in one category and half in the other. An example of the latter situation would be a questionnaire item with three ordinal responses, with 20% of the teachers giving each extreme response and 60% giving the middle response. Either possible dichotomy of this distribution puts 80% of the teachers in one category and 20% in the other, with the result that the median school, at the dividing point between quartiles 2 and 3, is one in which about 80% or 20% of the teachers give the designated response or responses. In practice, this problem is not so serious as it might seem. Its effect, like that of the misclassified schools discussed earlier, is probably to obscure genuine relationships more often than to create the appearance of nonexistent ones. In any case, whenever we introduce controls in our analysis, we usually group the quartiles so as to produce halves: quartiles 1 and 2 vs. quartiles 3 and 4. The range of percentages within a contextual half is usually fairly large, so that the schools and teachers in the two halves do differ markedly.

A problem in contextual analysis of the kind we are doing, in which group contexts are measured by aggregating the responses of group members, is that the contextual property assigned to a person on a given variable is not independent of his own response, since his own response is included in the measure of his group's response pattern. If, for example, we want to see whether a group atmosphere of bureaucratic submissiveness (variable 25S) produces submissive teachers (variable 25), we cannot do this by examining the relation between variables 25S and 25, since the two are positively related by definition. If the groups were extremely large, the error introduced by non-independence of the group and individual measures would be so small that it would not represent much of a problem, and some studies using contextual analysis with large groups have ignored it. We cannot afford to ignore it because our groups are so small that the error would be considerable. Perhaps a computer program could have been developed to remove each teacher analytically from his school when assigning its contextual properties to him, but we were told that this would be exceedingly laborious and expensive, and we did not attempt it.

The non-independence of individual and contextual measures of a given variable not only rules out examination of the effects of the group atmosphere on the individual with respect to the same variable. It also introduces difficulties in examining the effects of group characteristics with respect to one variable on individual characteristics with respect to another variable; but these difficulties can easily be surmounted. Suppose that we want to see whether a group atmosphere of bureaucratic submissiveness (25S) leads teachers to feel that they should not be involved in policy decisions (16). The problem here is to decide, if a relation is shown between variables 25S and 16, whether to attribute the relationship to the school's bureaucratic submissiveness or to the individual's bureaucratic submissiveness, which he might have had no matter what school he taught in, and which has entered into the measurement of his school's submissiveness. The solution is to control individual bureaucratic submissiveness (25) and look at the relation of 25S to 16 within the separate control categories. If 25S is related to 16 among teachers who are high on 25, and also among those who are low on 25, we have found a contextual effect which cannot be attributed to the amount of submissiveness (25) the individuals brought with them into the schools.

Table D-1 shows the range of percentages of teachers giving the designated responses included in each quartile of the contextual and school-as-unit variables which were arrived at in the way we have described above, the number of schools in each quartile of each variable, the means of the schools' percentages of teachers giving the designated responses, and similar information about variables 147S and 148S, which were calculated for all 9688 teachers in the sample. Distributions of variable 1S, 9, 112, and 113, which are used as contextual variables in some of our analysis, are shown elsewhere. The table also compares responses of individual teachers in the schools to which contextual measures were assigned with responses of teachers in the other schools. We now turn to this comparison.

Comparison of Responses of Teachers in Schools Included in, and Excluded from, S-Variable Analysis

We compared the responses to questions used in the contextual and school-as-unit analysis--the S-variables, as we have labeled them--of individual teachers in the 472 schools which met the criteria for contextaul analysis (N=5330) and of teachers in the schools not meeting these criteria (N=4338). The purpose of this comparison was to see if the teachers in the schools used for contextual analysis were roughly representative of the entire sample of teachers.

The two right-hand columns of Table D-1 give these comparisons. They show the percentages of all teachers in included and excluded schools who gave the responses on the basis of which the schools were assigned quartiles. For example, variable 10S classifies schools by the percentages of their teachers who were 40 years old or older. The two rightmost columns of Table D-1 show the percentages of individual teachers in schools included in and excluded from the S-variable analysis who were 40 or older.

In most respects the teachers in included and excluded schools were very similar, indicating that the characteristics of teachers in schools selected for contextual analysis were substantially representative of those of the entire teacher sample. The few items concerning which teachers in included and excluded schools differed by as much as 5.0% are as follows:

TABLE D-1. RANGES OF PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS GIVING DESIGNATED RESPONSES IN S-VARIABLE QUARTILES, NUMBERS OF SCHOOLS IN QUARTILES, MEANS OF SCHOOLS' PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS GIVING DESIGNATED RESPONSES, AND PERCENTAGES OF INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS IN INCLUDED AND EXCLUDED SCHOOLS GIVING DESIGNATED RESPONSES TO ITEMS CORRESPONDING TO S-VARIABLES

Variable and Total Number of Schools	Percentage Range and Number of Schools in Each Quartile				Mean of School %'s	Individual Teachers: Percentage Giving Designated Responses and Total N	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Included Schools	Excluded Schools
3S (471)	81.8-100.0 (120)	68.4-81.0 (101)	52.6-66.7 (120)	0.0-50.0 (130)	64.0	67.4 (5233)	73.9 (4245)
4S (471)	30.0-90.0 (120)	16.7-29.2 (121)	3.6-15.8 (103)	0.0 (127)	18.9	21.0 (5233)	28.3 (4245)
10S (468)	72.2-100.0 (117)	54.5-71.4 (117)	38.5-54.3 (116)	0.0-37.5 (118)	54.3	51.8 (5139)	48.6 (4159)
14S (470)	60.0-100.0 (122)	45.5-59.1 (110)	33.3-44.4 (123)	0.0-31.6 (115)	44.8	45.3 (5221)	46.1 (4239)
15S (470)	46.7-100.0 (119)	33.3-46.2 (127)	23.1-32.0 (101)	0.0-22.2 (123)	34.4	33.7 (5186)	35.4 (4229)
16S (471)	50.0-100.0 (134)	36.4-47.6 (103)	25.0-36.0 (126)	0.0-24.0 (108)	37.6	38.3 (5270)	42.6 (4275)
20S (468)	53.3-100.0 (117)	40.6-52.4 (111)	27.3-40.0 (124)	0.0-26.7 (116)	41.3	41.3 (5102)	42.8 (4133)
23S (468)	44.4-100.0 (118)	31.6-42.9 (116)	21.1-31.3 (114)	0.0-20.0 (120)	33.1	31.7 (5044)	32.8 (4055)

TABLE D-1 (continued)

Variable and Total Number of Schools	Percentage Range and Number of Schools in Each Quartile				Mean of School %'s	Individual Teachers: Percentage Giving Designated Responses and Total N	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Included Schools	Excluded Schools
25S (468)	57.9-100.0 (118)	47.4-57.1 (115)	35.0-47.1 (118)	0.0-34.8 (117)	46.9	46.9 (4989)	46.3 (4050)
33S (466)	37.5-80.0 (114)	26.3-36.4 (105)	14.3-25.0 (131)	0.0-12.5 (116)	25.6	26.7 (4746)	27.2 (3860)
37S (472)	78.6-100.0 (115)	61.1-77.8 (121)	42.9-60.0 (119)	0.0-42.1 (117)	59.3	61.6 (5242)	57.6 (4235)
38S (472)	50.0-100.0 (119)	34.4-48.0 (112)	25.0-33.3 (133)	0.0-23.1 (108)	36.3	35.6 (5278)	34.3 (4291)
41S (471)	81.8-100.0 (118)	63.2-81.6 (117)	40.0-62.5 (123)	0.0-33.5 (113)	59.4	61.8 (5288)	58.4 (4291)
42S (472)	52.6-100.0 (108)	33.3-50.0 (132)	18.2-32.4 (114)	0.0-17.6 (118)	35.2	35.7 (5277)	31.3 (4286)
45S (470)	69.2-100.0 (119)	50.0-68.8 (122)	28.6-47.1 (110)	0.0-27.3 (119)	48.5	49.3 (5208)	44.1 (4238)
46S (470)	80.8-100.0 (107)	65.0-80.0 (128)	43.8-63.6 (116)	0.0-42.9 (119)	61.6	60.6 (5221)	53.7 (4242)
47S (472)	63.2-100.0 (116)	45.5-62.5 (116)	26.7-44.4 (122)	0.0-26.1 (118)	45.2	43.3 (5294)	40.1 (4295)

TABLE D-1 (continued)

Variable and Total Number of Schools	Percentage Range and Number of Schools in Each Quartile				Mean of School %'s	Individual Teachers: Percentage Giving Designated Responses and Total N	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Included Schools	Excluded Schools
48S (470)	73.7-100.0 (118)	53.3-73.3 (118)	29.4-52.9 (116)	0.0-28.6 (118)	51.4	52.5 (5291)	50.5 (4282)
49S (472)	73.7-100.0 (116)	54.5-73.3 (124)	36.8-53.8 (113)	0.0-36.4 (119)	53.7	55.0 (5294)	54.1 (4295)
50S (470)	64.3-100.0 (118)	50.0-63.6 (121)	33.3-47.4 (117)	0.0-31.8 (114)	48.0	45.0 (5172)	41.8 (4208)
52S (469)	55.5-100.0 (117)	41.7-54.5 (114)	25.0-40.0 (129)	0.0-23.8 (109)	40.7	40.3 (5146)	39.6 (4189)
56S (466)	46.2-100.0 (116)	30.4-45.8 (117)	20.0-30.0 (125)	0.0-19.2 (108)	33.5	31.7 (4930)	30.3 (3958)
60S (466)	54.5-100.0 (116)	40.0-54.2 (119)	25.9-38.9 (114)	0.0-25.0 (117)	40.7	38.9 (4956)	36.4 (3979)
61S (472)	34.6-81.8 (114)	25.0-33.3 (131)	14.3-24.3 (112)	0.0-13.3 (115)	24.9	25.1 (5291)	28.3 (4290)
65S (472)	75.0-100.0 (120)	60.0-73.5 (117)	46.2-58.8 (115)	0.0-45.5 (120)	59.1	57.4 (5223)	48.0 (4229)
67S (472)	89.5-100.0 (117)	76.2-88.9 (114)	60.0-75.0 (127)	0.0-59.3 (114)	73.5	71.0 (5161)	64.3 (4176)

TABLE D-1 (continued)

Variable and Total Number of Schools	Percentage Range and Number of Schools in Each Quartile				Mean of School %'s	Individual Teachers: Percentage Giving Designated Responses and Total N	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Included Schools	Excluded Schools
71S (472)	85.7-100.0 (123)	68.4-84.6 (113)	50.0-68.0 (124)	0.0-47.1 (112)	65.4	68.9 (5268)	65.9 (4258)
72S (472)	57.7-100.0 (117)	37.9-57.1 (117)	21.1-37.5 (117)	0.0-20.0 (121)	40.7	42.2 (5293)	39.5 (4299)
73S (472)	52.9-100.0 (116)	30.3-50.0 (119)	13.6-30.0 (119)	0.0-13.3 (118)	34.3	35.0 (5273)	32.5 (4285)
74S (471)	57.1-100.0 (117)	40.0-56.3 (118)	23.1-39.5 (119)	0.0-22.7 (117)	40.3	41.1 (5330)	37.7 (4337)
75S (471)	71.4-100.0 (116)	52.4-70.0 (103)	33.3-50.0 (140)	0.0-31.6 (112)	50.5	51.9 (5205)	48.4 (4198)
79S (402)	85.7-100.0 (105)	75.0-84.6 (92)	55.6-71.4 (106)	0.0-50.0 (99)	69.1	69.9 (2665)	68.0 (2029)
100S (472)	78.9-100.0 (119)	62.5-78.6 (121)	44.4-61.1 (114)	0.0-43.8 (118)	59.9	62.4 (5297)	62.2 (4307)
101S (472)	58.8-100.0 (116)	40.0-58.3 (127)	25.0-39.1 (122)	0.0-23.5 (107)	41.7	40.4 (5294)	37.9 (4291)
104S (471)	40.0-100.0 (125)	27.3-38.5 (114)	17.6-26.3 (114)	0.0-17.4 (118)	30.2	27.8 (5262)	25.3 (4267)

TABLE D-1 (continued)

Variable and Total Number of Schools	Percentage Range and Number of Schools in Each Quartile				Mean of School %'s	Individual Teachers: Percentage Giving Designated Responses and Total N	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Included Schools	Excluded Schools
106S (472)	50.0-100.0 (118)	33.3-47.4 (131)	20.8-31.8 (97)	0.0-20.0 (126)	34.9	35.8 (5207)	42.1 (4266)
110S (472)	46.2-100.0 (115)	34.6-45.5 (110)	23.5-33.3 (126)	0.0-23.1 (121)	34.6	35.2 (5330)	35.3 (4338)
126S (437)	69.2-100.0 (109)	57.1-66.7 (109)	38.5-56.3 (110)	0.0-37.5 (109)	54.5	57.8 (4287)	59.3 (3621)
F126S (431)	69.2-100.0 (98)	55.6-66.7 (117)	38.5-55.0 (107)	0.0-37.5 (109)	53.6	52.5 (3367)	53.7 (2739)
143S (472)	33.3-100.0 (122)	17.2-32.4 (114)	4.3-16.7 (117)	0.0 (119)	21.1	21.9 (5296)	24.4 (4292)
144S (472)	37.5-100.0 (118)	21.7-36.8 (118)	8.3-21.4 (118)	010-7.7 (118)	24.4	23.2 (5234)	23.7 (4254)
149S (469)	26.1-75.0 (111)	12.5-25.0 (129)	3.4-12.0 (65)	0.0 (164)	15.6	17.8 (5189)	20.3 (4185)
150S (472)	59.1-100.0 (118)	41.2-58.3 (117)	25.0-40.0 (120)	0.0-23.5 (117)	41.2	39.7 (5177)	38.2 (4160)
152S (472)	42.1-100.0 (117)	30.0-41.7 (118)	17.6-29.4 (119)	0.0-17.4 (118)	31.6	31.6 (5177)	31.1 (4160)

Table D-1 (continued)

Variable and Total Number of Schools	Percentage Range and Number of Schools in Each Quartile				Mean of School %'s	Individual Teachers: Percentage Giving Designated Responses and Total N	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Included Schools	Excluded Schools
164S (472)	76.7-100.0 (118)	51.7-75.9 (106)	28.6-50.0 (130)	0.0-27.3 (118)	51.9	54.8 (5177)	47.3 (4235)
165S (466)	57.9-100.0 (115)	40.0-57.1 (126)	26.1-38.9 (105)	0.0-25.0 (120)	42.1	41.4 (4771)	48.8 (3848)
162E(S) (280)	50.0-100.0 (78)	36.4-47.1 (62)	25.0-35.3 (72)	0.0-23.1 (68)	36.9	35.6 (2366)	39.3 (1517)
162S(S) (86)	31.6-51.7 (21)	21.1-31.3 (22)	13.0-20.0 (20)	0.0-12.5 (23)	22.5	23.6 (1239)	20.2 (811)

3, type of college attended. Teachers in excluded schools were 6.5% more likely (73.9% vs. 67.4%) to have master's degrees, or bachelor's degrees from liberal arts colleges or universities rather than from teachers' colleges.

4, highest degree attained. Teachers in excluded schools were 7.3% more likely to have done graduate work beyond the bachelor's degree. This difference probably accounts for the difference in variable 3, type of college attended, since in variable 3, anyone with a master's degree was defined as having attended a high-quality college.

45, principal's normative compliance index. Included teachers were 5.2% more likely than excluded teachers to rate their principals high in normative compliance.

46, principal's backing of teacher index. Included teachers were 6.9% more likely to rate their principals high in this respect. This finding is not independent of the finding concerning variable 45, since questionnaire item C76 is included in both of these two-item indexes.

65, attraction to colleagues index. Included teachers were 9.4% more likely to describe themselves as highly attracted to colleagues.

67, absence of inner circle. Included teachers were 6.7% more likely to say that there was no "inner circle of teachers" in their schools.

106, occupational community. Excluded teachers were 6.3% more likely to report high occupational community.

164, perceived social class of students. Included teachers were 7.5% more likely to say that most of their students were from middle-class or upper-class homes.

165, days attending professional meetings. Excluded teachers were 7.4% more likely to report five or more days' attendance at professional meetings in an average year.

Thus the included and excluded teachers differed by as much as 5% on only nine of the 48 variables examined. Of these nine, variables 3 and 4 are not independent of each other since possession of a master's degree enters into both of them, and variables 45 and 46 are two-item indexes with one of the items common to them; therefore we find, in effect, only seven differences between included and excluded teachers.

All of these differences between included and excluded teachers can be accounted for by race differences reported elsewhere. A larger percentage of Negro than of white teachers were in schools excluded from

S-variable analysis, because the response rate of Negro teachers was low and a criterion for inclusion of a school in the S-variable analysis was that its response rate be 50% or higher. Therefore we find a few differences between included and excluded teachers, all of them concerning variables on which the races differed. Whites, and hence included teachers, were more likely to rate their principals high in normative compliance and backing of the teacher, to feelattracted to colleagues, to see no inner circle of teachers in their schools, and to perceive their students as middle-class. Negroes, and hence excluded teachers, were more likely to have education beyond the bachelor's degree, to report high occupational community, and to attend professional meetings frequently. This interpretation could be verified by retabulating the figures with race controlled, but we have not done so since the issue at hand, similarity of teachers included in and excluded from S-variable analysis, is unrelated to the main purposes of the study and has been examined only to establish in a rough way the generalizability of findings based on contextual and school-as-unit analysis.

With so few differences exceeding 5% and none reaching 10%, we feel that the generalizability has been established. A further indication of it, not shown in the table, is that the percentages of teachers who did not answer particular questions, among those who returned usable questionnaires, were almost identical among respondents in included and excluded schools on each of the 48 variables. The table does not show this because the nonrespondents on given variables were removed from the percentage bases in these as in other tabulations. The only surprise which emerges from these comparisons of included and excluded teachers is that there were not more differences between them, since there were race differences concerning many of the variables involved.

APPENDIX E

THE CODE USED TO CLASSIFY FATHERS' AND SPOUSES' OCCUPATIONS

Angell G. Beza of the Institute for Research in Social Science devised this code and the set of examples, after consulting with the project director about the general type of classification which was desired. Mr. Beza also supervised the entire coding process for the whole questionnaire, including the coding of occupations and much else besides. The code is meant to represent a rough status ordering of occupational categories, but with teachers and principals a separate category and with inevitable lumping together of people with diverse educational and income characteristics in the agricultural and business proprietor or executive categories. The code was used for all questions dealing with occupations of fathers or spouses, in both the teacher and the college student questionnaires. Coders were instructed to consult the Dictionary of Occupational Titles if in doubt, and Mr. Beza or the project director if still in doubt. The coders were college students with some background in sociology.

Classification of Occupations

1. Professional, higher status than teachers. Doctors, dentists, lawyers, judges, engineers, architects, college presidents, professors, editors, scientists, instructors, researchers, sociologists, psychologists, etc.

2. Professional or semi-professional, same status as teachers or lower. Photographers, pharmacists, chiropractors, nurses, therapists, accountants and auditors, navigators, ship personnel, missionaries, artists and musicians, clergymen, reporters, dieticians, medical and health technicians, draftsmen, librarians, military officers, "journalism," social workers, systems analysts, health professions other than physicians and dentists, sanitarians, surveyors, employment interviewers, meteorologists, home demonstrators, landscaping designers, funeral directors, cartographers, fashion counselors, public relations men, budget directors, recreation directors.

3. Business proprietors or executive. Buyers, department managers, union officials, merchants, "business," "superintendent" (depending on work), grocers, contractors, bank presidents, company owners, presidents and board chairmen, freight checkers, area appraisers, "banker," "industry," diplomatic service, police chiefs, sheriffs, distributors, dealers.

4. Other white collar, excluding teachers and principals. (Sales and clerical workers.) Secretaries, stenographers, typists, bank tellers, bill collectors, bookkeepers, cashiers, file clerks, insurance adjusters, examiners, and investigators, advertising agents, salesmen, telephone operators, real estate agents, brokers, telegraphers, civil service or government workers not clearly of executive level, depot operators or agents, merchandisers, dispatchers, shipping clerks, collection managers.

5. Agriculture, all forms. Farmers, farm workers, tenant farmers, sharecroppers.

6. Skilled blue collar. (Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.) Brick masons, carpenters, electricians, excavators, grading and road machinery operators, painters (construction and maintenance), plumbers, metal craftsmen including die makers and setters and sheet metal workers, bakers, bookbinders, cabinet makers, military enlisted men, railroad engineers, all mechanics, machinists, printers, railroad car inspectors, plasterers, tailors, railroad brakemen, auto body builders, cement finishers, radio engineers, butchers, millers.

7. All other blue collar workers and service workers. Drivers and deliverymen, taxi drivers, bus and streetcar conductors, dry cleaning operatives, sailors (non-military), housekeepers, servants, boarding house keepers, elevator operators, hairdressers, janitors, sextons, kitchen workers, cooks, porters, miners, all textile workers except foremen, railroad switchmen, policemen, firemen, mailmen, fishermen, warehousemen, amusement operators.

8. Teacher (below college level) or principcal.

APPENDIX F

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Stuart. "Regional Differences in Vertical Mobility in a High-Status Occupation," *American Sociological Review*, 15 (1950), pp. 228-235.

Archibald, Katherine. *War Time Shipyard*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1947.

Babchuk, Nicholas. "Primary Friends and Kin: A Study of the Associations of Middle-Class Couples," *Social Forces*, 43 (1965), pp. 483-493.

Babchuk, Nicholas and Alan P. Bates. "The Primary Relations of Middle-Class Couples: A Study in Male Dominance," *American Sociological Review*, 28 (1963), pp. 377-384.

Barton, Allen H. *Organizational Measurement and Its Bearing on the Study of College Environments*, New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1961.

Beale, Howard K. *Are American Teachers Free?* New York: Scribner's, 1936.

Becker, Howard S. "The Career of the Chicago Public Schoolteacher," *American Journal of Sociology*, 57 (1952), pp. 470-477.

_____. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public Schools," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 27 (1953), pp. 129-141.

Becker, Howard S. and James W. Carper. "The Development of Identification with an Occupation," *American Journal of Sociology*, 61 (1956), pp. 289-298.

Becker, Howard S. and Blanche Geer. "The Fate of Idealism in Medical School," *American Sociological Review*, 23 (1958), pp. 50-56.

Bell, Daniel. *The End of Ideology*, rev. ed., New York: Free Press, 1962.

_____. *The New American Right*, New York: Criterion, 1955.

Bernard, Jessie. *Academic Women*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan. *The American Occupational Structure*, New York: Wiley, 1967.

Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. *Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach*, San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Blauner, Robert. "Occupational Differences in Work Satisfaction," in Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson (eds.), Social Organization and Behavior, New York: Wiley, 1964, pp. 282-292. Reprinted from pp. 341-352 of Walter Galenson and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Labor and Trade Unionism: An Interdisciplinary Reader, New York: Wiley, 1960, pp. 339-360.

Blood, Robert O. and Donald M. Wolfe. Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living, New York: Free Press, 1960.

Bond, John R. and W. Edgar Vinacke. "Coalitions in Mixed-Sex Triads," Sociometry, 24 (1961), pp. 61-75.

Bressler, Marvin and William M. Kephart. Career Dynamics, Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Nurses' Association, 1955.

Bryan, Alice I., The Public Librarian, New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Carlson, Richard O. "Variations and Myth in the Social Status of Teachers," Journal of Educational Sociology, 35 (1951), pp. 104-118.

Carr-Saunders, Alexander M. and P. A. Wilson. The Professions, Oxford (England): Clarendon Press, 1933, Part III.

Carter, Lewis F. "Inadvertent Sociological Theory," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, New Orleans, April 1969.

Chapin, F. Stuart, Jr. and Shirley F. Weiss (eds.). Urban Growth Dynamics, New York: Wiley, 1962.

Charters, W. W., Jr. "Survival in the Teaching Profession: A Criterion for Selecting Teacher Trainees," Journal of Teacher Education, 7 (1953), pp. 253-255.

Cicourel, Aaron V. and John I. Kitsuse. The Educational Decision-Makers, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963.

Coffman, Lotus Delta. The Social Composition of the Teaching Population, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1911.

Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society, New York: Free Press, 1961.

Coleman, James S., Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederic D. Weinfield, and Robert L. York, Equality of Education Opportunity, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coleman, James S., Elihu Katz, and Herbert Menzel. "The Diffusion of Innovations among Physicians," *Sociometry*, 20 (1957), pp. 253-270.

Colombotos, John L. *Sources of Professionalism: A Study of High School Teachers*, Cooperative Research Project No. 330, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Department of Sociology, 1962.

Cook, Lloyd A., Ronald B. Almack, and Florence Greenhoe. "The Teacher and Community Relations," *American Sociological Review*, 3 (1938), pp. 167-174.

Cook, Lloyd A., and Florence Greenhoe. "Community Contacts of 9,122 Teachers," *Social Forces*, 19 (1940), pp. 63-72.

Corwin, Ronald G. *A Sociology of Education*, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965.

Corwin, Ronald G. "Militant Professionalism, Initiative and Compliance in Public Education," *Sociology of Education*, 38 (1965), pp. 310-331.

Counts, George S. *School and Society in Chicago*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928.

Cussler, Margaret. *The Woman Executive*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1958.

Dahmer, Claude, Jr., and Elliot McGinnis. "Shifting Sentiments toward Civil Rights in a Southern University," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 13 (1949), pp. 241-251.

Davis, James A. *Great Aspirations*, Chicago: Aldine, 1964.

_____. *Undergraduate Career Decisions*, Chicago, Ill.: Aldine, 1965.

Deutscher, Irwin. "A Survey of the Social and Occupational Characteristics of a Metropolitan Nurse Complement," Kansas City, Mo.: Community Studies, Inc., 1956.

Dubin, Robert. "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," *Social Problems*, 4 (1956), pp. 131-142.

Ennis, Philip H. and Howard W. Winger (eds.). *Seven Questions about the Profession of Librarianship*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Etzioni, Amitai. *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations*, New York: Free Press, 1961.

Etzioni, Amitai. *Modern Organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

_____(ed.). *Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

_____(ed.). *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization*, New York: Free Press, 1969.

Fensham, Peter J. and Douglas Hooper. *The Dynamics of a Changing Technology*, London: Tavistock, 1964.

"The Fortune Survey," *Fortune*, May 1947, pp. 15-21, and June 1947, pp. 5-10.

Freidson, Eliot. "Client Control and Medical Practice," *American Journal of Sociology*, 65 (1960), pp. 374-382.

Galenson, Walter and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.). *Labor and Trade Unionism: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, New York: Wiley, 1960.

Gates, Davida P. "The Professional Socialization of Student Teachers in North Carolina," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964.

Gerstl, Joel E. "Determinants of Occupational Community in High-Status Occupations," *Sociological Quarterly*, 2 (1961), pp. 37-48.

Gold, Joy Rochelle. "The Effect of Administrative Atmosphere on the Role of the School Teacher," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1964.

Goode, William J. "The Librarian: From Occupation to Profession?" in Philip H. Ennis and Howard W. Winger (eds.), *Seven Questions about the Profession of Librarianship*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, pp. 8-22.

_____. "The Theoretical Limits of Professionalization," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization*, New York: Free Press, 1969, pp. 266-313.

Gordon, Robert A. *Business Leadership in the Large Corporation*, with a new preface, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "The Secrets of Organizations," in *The Social Welfare Forum, 1963*, Official Proceedings, 90th Annual Forum, National Conference on Social Welfare, New York: Columbia University Press, 1963, pp. 162-164.

Greenhoe, Florence. *Community Contacts and Participation of Teachers*, Washington: American Council on Public Affairs, 1941.

Gross, Neal. *Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role*, New York: Wiley, 1958.

_____. *Who Runs Our Schools?*, New York: Wiley, 1958.

Gross, Neal and Robert E. Herriott. *Staff Leadership in Public Schools*, New York: Wiley, 1965.

Habenstein, Robert W. and Edwin A. Christ. *Professionalizer, Traditionalizer and Utilizer*, 2nd ed., Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1963.

Haralick, Joy Gold. "Teacher Acceptance of Administrative Action," *Journal of Experimental Education*, 37 (1968), pp. 39-47.

Havighurst, Robert J. and Bernice L. Neugarten. *Society and Education*, 2nd ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957.

Havighurst, Robert J. and Hilda Taba. *Adolescent Character and Personality*, New York: Wiley, 1949.

Hoffelder, Robert Lloyd. "The Married Woman School Teacher: A Study of Role Conflict," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964.

Hollingshead, A. B. *Elmtown's Youth*, New York: Wiley, 1949.

Hughes, Everett C., Helen MacGill Hughes, and Irwin Deutscher, *Twenty Thousand Nurses Tell Their Story*, Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1958.

Jacob, Philip. *Changing Values in College*, New York: Harper, 1957.

James, John. "Clique Organization in a Small Industrial Plant," *Pacific Sociological Review, Research Studies, State College of Washington*, 19 (1951), pp. 126-129.

Knapp, R. H. and H. B. Goodrich. *Origins of American Scientists*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Problems in Methodology," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell (eds.), *Sociology Today*, New York: Basic Books, 1959, pp. 39-78.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Herbert Menzel. "On the Relation Between Individual and Collective Properties," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), *Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961, pp. 422-440.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind, New York: Free Press, 1958.

Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. "Social Mobility and Urbanization," Rural Sociology, 20 (1955), pp. 220-228.

Lipset, Seymour Martin and Reinhard Bendix. Social Mobility in Industrial Society, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, Martin Trow, and James Coleman. Union Democracy, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1962. Originally published by Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, in 1956.

Lortie, Dan C. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, New York: Free Press, 1969, pp. 1-53.

Manwiller, Lloyd. "Expectations Regarding Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, 26 (1958), pp. 315-354.

Martin, Harry W. and Ida Harper Simpson. Patterns of Psychiatric Nursing: A Study of Psychiatric Nursing in North Carolina, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Institute for Research in Social Science, 1956.

Mason, Ward S. The Beginning Teacher: Status and Career Aspirations, OE-23009, Circular No. 644, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

Mattefeld, Jacquelyn A. and Carol G. Van Aken (eds.). Women and the Scientific Professions, Cambridge, Mass. and London, England: M.I.T. Press, 1965.

Merton, Robert K., Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell (eds.). Sociology Today, New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Miller, Hugh Max. "Teacher Roles and Community Integration," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964.

More, Douglas M. "A Note on Occupational Origins of the Health Service Professions," American Sociological Review, 25 (1960), pp. 403-404.

Naegele, Kaspar D. and Elaine Culley Stolar. "Income and Prestige," Library Journal, 85 (1960), pp. 2888-2891.

National Education Association. The Status of the American Public-School Teacher, Washington: NEA, 1957.

Newcomb, Theodore M. Personality and Social Change, New York: Dryden, 1943.

Nikkel, Stan R. "Characteristcs of the Informal Organization: An Observational Study of the United States Committee for UNICEF," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964.

Orzack, Louis H. "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals," Social Forces, 7 (1959), pp. 125-132.

Parsons, Talcott. The Social System, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.

_____. "The Professions and Social Structure," Social Forces, 17 (1939), pp. 457-467.

_____. "Professions," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1968, Vol. 12, pp. 536-547.

Polansky, Norman, William Bowen, Lucille Gordon, and Conrad Nathan, "Social Workers in Society," Journal of Social Work, 34 (1953), pp. 74-80.

Rosenberg, Morris. Occupations and Values, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.

Rossi, Alice S. "Barriers to the Career Choice of Engineering, Medicine or Science among American Women," in Jacquelyn A. Mattefeld and Carold G. Van Aken (eds.), Women and the Scientific Professions, Cambridge, Mass. and London, England: M.I.T. Press, 1965, pp. 51-127.

Rossi, Peter H. "Discussion," in Philip H. Ennis and Howard W. Winger (eds.), Seven Questions about the Profession of Librarianship, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, p. 83.

Rosten, Leo. The Washington Correspondents, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1938.

"The Scientists: A Group Portrait," Fortune, October 1948, pp. 106-112.

Seeman, Melvin M. Social Status and Leadership: The Case of the School Executive, Columbus: Bureau of Educational Research and Service, Ohio State University, 1960.

Selvin, Hanan C. The Effects of Leadership, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960. Based on a 1956 Ph.D. dissertation at Columbia University.

Simpson, Ida Harper. "The Development of Professional Self-Images among Student Nurses," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1956.

_____. "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, 37 (1967), pp. 47-54.

Simpson, Richard L. "Occupational Careers and Mobility," in F. Stuart Chapin, Jr. and Shirley F. Weiss (eds.), Urban Growth Dynamics, New York: Wiley, 1962, pp. 400-420.

Simpson, Richard L. and Ida Harper Simpson. "Occupational Choice among Career-Oriented College Women," Marriage and Family Living, 23 (1961), pp. 377-383.

_____ (eds.). Social Organization and Behavior: A Reader in General Sociology, New York: Wiley, 1964.

_____. "Values, Personal Influence, and Occupational Choice," Social Forces, 39 (1960), pp. 116-125.

_____. "Women and Bureaucracy in the Semi-Professions," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, New York: Free Press, 1969, pp. 196-265.

Smuts, Robert W. Women and Work in America, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Uesugi, Thomas K. and W. Edgar Vinacke. "Strategy in a Feminine Game," Sociometry, 26 (1963), pp. 75-88.

"The U.S. Bar," Fortune, May 1939, p. 176.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Fifteenth Census of the U.S.: 1930, Population, Vol. IV, Occupations by State.

_____. Census of Population: 1950, Vol II, Characteristics of the Population, Part I, United States Summary.

Vidich, Arthur J. and Joseph Bensman. Small Town in Mass Society, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958.

Vinacke, W. Edgar. "Sex Roles in a Three-Person Game," Sociometry, 22 (1959), pp. 343-360.

Wagenschein, Miriam. "Reality Shock," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1951.

Waller, Willard, The Sociology of Teaching, New York: Wiley, 1932.

Wattenberg, William et al. "Social Origins of Teachers," in Lindley J. Stiles (ed.), The Teacher's Role in American Society, New York: Harper, 1957, pp. 13-16.

Webster's New International Dictionary, unabridged, 2nd ed., Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1934.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary, unabridged, Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1961.

Wheeler, Sara H. "Children's Librarians of the Northwest," in Morton Kroll (ed.), Libraries and Librarians of the Pacific Northwest, Pacific Northwest Library Association, Library Development Project Reports, Vol. IV., 1960.

Wilensky, Harold L. "The Professionalization of Everyone?" American Journal of Sociology, 70 (1964), pp. 137-158.

Wilensky, Harold L. and Charles N. Lebeaux. Industrial Society and Social Welfare, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.

Wolfle, Dael. America's Resources of Specialized Talent, New York: Harper, 1954.

Women's Bureau. 1962 Handbook on Women Workers, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

Wright, Charles R. "Changes in the Occupational Commitment of Graduate Sociology Students: A Research Note," Sociological Inquiry, 37 (1967), pp. 55-62.

Zander, Alvin, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland. Role Relations in the Mental Health Professions, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Research Center for Group Dynamics, 1957.